



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600088057Y

An Eirenicon

OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

RIVINGTONS

London *Waterloo Place.*
Oxford *Magdalen Street.*
Cambridge *Trinity Street.*

[*All rights reserved.*]

An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century

PROPOSAL

FOR

CATHOLIC COMMUNION

BY A MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

New Edition

WITH INTRODUCTION, NOTES, AND APPENDICES

*Ut unus omnes unicum
Ovile nos Pastor regat*

EDITED BY

HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A.

AUTHOR OF "DR. PUSEY'S EIRENICON CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO CATHOLIC UNITY;"
"LECTURES ON THE REUNION OF THE CHURCHES," TRANSLATED, WITH PREFACES,
FROM THE GERMAN OF J. I. VON DÖLLINGER, ETC. ETC.



RIVINGTONS

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

MDCCCLXXIX

110. m. 612.

TO
THE DEAR AND HOLY MEMORY
OF
AMBROSE LISLE MARSH PHILLIPPS DE LISLE
LATE OF GARENDON PARK AND GRACE DIEU MANOR, LEICESTERSHIRE,
PRINCIPAL FOUNDER OF THE A.P.U.C.,
WHO WITH PURE AND SINGLE-MINDED DEVOTION
OFFERED UP
THE PRAYERS, THE SYMPATHIES, AND THE ENERGIES OF A LIFETIME
FOR "THE FUTURE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM,"
THIS VOLUME
IS REVERENTLY AND AFFECTIONATELY
INSCRIBED.

OBDORMIVIT IN DOMINO III NON. MART. MDCCCLXXVIII. R.I.P.

Beati Pacifici.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

THE occasion of the present publication may be explained in very few words. A copy of the Dublin reprint of 1781 of the *Proposal for Catholic Communion*, belonging to a venerable and pious parish priest, came into my hands quite accidentally last autumn during a tour in Ireland. On finding that the book had long been out of print, and is very rare, it occurred to me, after careful perusal, and consultation with others whose judgment could not but have great weight in the matter, that it was well worth republishing under the altered circumstances of our own day, and I obtained permission of the present owner, to whom my thanks are due, and are hereby gratefully accorded, to use the copy lent me for that purpose.¹ It has since been collated with the original

¹ The republication was suggested in an article in the *Saturday Review* for September 8, 1877.

edition of 1704, of which it is an exact reprint, with the exception of certain typographical corrections designed to adapt the spelling, etc., to contemporary usage.¹ Of the authorship of the work, about which nothing is certainly known, as well as of the contents, it will be more convenient to speak in the Introduction. Suffice it to observe here that the notion of its emanating from a Nonjuror is decisively negatived alike by internal and external evidence.² On the other hand, the argument gains additional interest and force, as coming evidently, and indeed avowedly, from what would now be called a man of moderate opinions, as well as from the date of its first appearance, and the date and place of its republication in 1781. While the author professes himself deeply impressed with the severity of the ancient Fathers in denouncing the sin of schism, and the glaring contrast presented by the existing condition of Christendom to "the beauty and glory of the primitive Church," he at the same time dwells on the pressing danger from

¹ I am indebted for the loan of a copy of the original edition of 1704 to the kindness of the Rev. Dr. Littledale, and for copies of the editions of 1801 and 1812 to the Rev. J. B. Wilkinson and Rev. Dr. F. G. Lee. There is a copy of the original edition, bound up with some other works, in the British Museum, and of the 1801 edition, but not of the Dublin or the 1812 editions.

² This would be sufficiently indicated by the fact that Archbishop Sharp, from one of whose published sermons the "Rules" in chapter i. are mainly derived, was a supporter and nominee of William III.

“the vice, errors, atheism, and irreligion,” caused by our unhappy divisions, which are “visible marks of God’s just indignation against us.” The first consideration holds good of course equally for every age; the practical weight of the second has enormously increased during the two centuries since the author wrote.

It only remains to add that the present edition is literally reprinted from that of 1781, itself an exact reprint of the original edition of 1704, with the exception of such purely typographical corrections, in spelling, punctuation, and the like, as are requisite for the convenience of modern readers. For all bracketed passages and notes, as well as for the Introduction and Appendices, the editor is exclusively responsible. Great care has been taken, wherever it was possible, to verify the references in the text; not always an easy matter, considering the vague and casual manner of citing authorities usual in the author’s time, and the fact that several of the works he mentions are out of print, and that no attempt at verification in any single instance has been made by previous editors.¹

¹ So utterly careless have they been that where a wrong reference is given, no doubt by a misprint originally, to so well-known a book, *e.g.*, as Cave’s *Primitive Christianity*, the same incorrect paging is reproduced in every edition down to 1812.

There are three short footnotes only in the Dublin edition, which I have retained, and four in the editions of 1801 and 1812, two of which are omitted here as irrelevant, and one because it gives an incorrect explanation of a term which requires none.

H. N. O.

Michaelmas 1878.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITOR'S PREFACE, ...	vii
INTRODUCTION, ...	1
ORIGINAL TITLE-PAGE, ...	97
„ PREFACE, ...	99
„ CONTENTS, ...	103
AN ESSAY TOWARDS A PROPOSAL FOR CATHOLIC COMMUNION, ...	105
APPENDIX A.—LETTER OF BISHOP DOYLE, ...	317
APPENDIX B.—ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, ...	326

INTRODUCTION.

IT will not be out of place to introduce the following Eirenicon to the notice of the reader by a brief review of the principal efforts made from time to time in the same direction, before and since, and of the primary conditions requisite for bringing any such scheme to a successful issue. There has never in truth been a period, since the final consummation of the schism of the sixteenth century, when aspirations for reunion have not been more or less earnestly and influentially manifested on either side, both in England and in Germany. And it is well worth noting that the energetic expression of this desire is so far from being confined to professed theologians, that many of its leading exponents, as will appear in the sequel, have been laymen. The division of East and West, though beginning in the ninth century, was not finally consummated till the middle of the twelfth, and even then communications were not altogether broken off between the separated Churches. On two subsequent occasions—at the Council of Lyons in 1274, and at Florence in 1442—a definite basis of reunion was for the moment agreed upon, though, for reasons we cannot stay to examine in detail here, it failed to secure permanent acceptance in the East.

And in the same way Döllinger has shown how "the notion of a permanent separation from the ancient Church had not occurred to the generation of the Reformation era in Germany."¹ They considered themselves to be only renewing that demand for "a reform of the Church in her head and in her members," which had been in the air, so to say, for centuries, and in the previous century had found direct and authoritative expression at the reforming Council of Constance. For many years all diets and religious conferences were conducted on the assumption that both parties still belonged to the same universal Church, and would eventually be able to come to an understanding with each other. At the Conference of Ratisbon in 1541, where Contarini represented the Holy See, and Melanchthon the Protestants, an agreement was actually arrived at on the four crucial points of the nature of man, original sin, justification, and redemption; but Luther refused to accept it.² Even when the Augsburg religious treaty of 1555 established a legal and political separation, the Estates of the Empire still professed to look forward to a future General Council, and for a long time afterwards the state of separation was treated as temporary and provisional. But the formal publication of the Tridentine Decrees on the one hand (1564), and of the Formulary of Concord on the other (1577), did much to fix, if not to widen the breach; and, worst of all, the whole weight of the rapidly growing

¹ Döllinger's *Lectures on Reunion of the Churches*, p. 74.

² See Ranke's *History of the Popes*, vol. i. p. 109.

influence of the Jesuit Order, who became virtually supreme through their command of Catholic education, of Court favour, and of the Confessional, was thrown into the adverse scale. The conciliatory tone of men like Witzel, Erasmus, Cassander, Staphylus in Germany, and Gentien, Hervet, D'Espenser, and L'Hôpital in France, was rudely superseded by the ruthless and uncompromising partisanship of Jesuit controversialists like Laynez, Salmeron, and Canisius. Yet even a century after the original separation, the hope of reunion found expression in the Articles of the Westphalian Peace, which fixed the boundary-lines only until "by the grace of God" a friendly settlement of pending religious differences should be attained.

And the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of England, where the Reformation came from above, not from beneath, and was a political rather than a religious movement. The cruel and suicidal persecutions of Mary's reign, which—it has been too truly said—"are written in letters of fire and blood in the annals of England," and provoked hardly less terrible reprisals under her successor, did much to widen the breach.¹ And the attitude of Paul iv., Pius v., and

¹ At the same time, Dr. Lingard is fully justified in observing that Mary's persecuting policy was "her misfortune rather than her fault," inasmuch as in that age "the extirpation of erroneous doctrines was inculcated by the leaders of every religious party," and, he might have added, practised by them whenever they had the opportunity. "The toleration of heresy," says Sir James Mackintosh (*English History*, vol. ii. p. 266), "was deemed, by men of all persuasions, to be as unreasonable as it would now be thought to propose the impunity of murder." The principal sufferers under Mary had themselves been ruthless persecutors under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and even the gentle Melancthon commended the cruel and treacherous burning of Servetus. It is also fair to remember that the chief victims of

Paul v. was the reverse of conciliatory ; so much so, indeed, that Urban viii. said afterwards that the Popes his predecessors were responsible for the loss of England.¹ Yet, in spite of Papal intolerance and persecution on one side, and the growth of Puritanism on the other, it was long before the alienation of England from visible unity was recognised, either at Rome or by the highest authorities at home, as an accomplished fact. The fanatical Puritanism of Edward's reign was a Court exotic, which found no welcome in the hearts of the people till it had been nursed by the fires of Smithfield into a vitality not its own. The religious *régime*—it can hardly be called a system—of Cranmer and Bucer, with its frigid ritual and shifting evanescent creed, imperfectly enforced for the moment at the sword's point on a reluctant and half-rebellious nation, passed away with its authors like an evil dream, and but for the insane policy of the succeeding reign would have left no trace behind it. And it is abundantly clear from *Machyn's Diary*, as well as from other sources, how partial and gradual was the religious change, whether in belief or worship, under Elizabeth.² She

Mary's persecution, notably Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, had rendered themselves fully liable to capital punishment for high treason. Still, after all deductions, and after discounting the exploded mendacities of Foxe, we must deplore and condemn the unhappy policy pursued, and may well acquiesce in Charles Butler's charitable suggestion : " Let Protestants cease to reproach the Roman Catholics with Mary's fires, and Roman Catholics shall be equally silent on the sanguinary code of Elizabeth and the savage executions under it."—*Book of Roman Catholic Church*, p. 223.

¹ So again the Rev. J. Berington says, in his *Introduction to Memoirs of Panzani*, p. 7 : " To Paul iv. perhaps may be imputed the defection of England from the communion of Rome."

² *Ibid.* p. 17 ; cf. Bp. Forbes, *Explanation of Articles*, Dedication, pp. 18, 19.

was herself very slow to close the door to any possible reconciliation with Rome, and, as Mr. Froude puts it, "clung convulsively" to the hope of reunion "on some moderate common ground, such as might have been found for all Europe, had not passion been called in to deal with questions which only intellect could grapple with."¹ Then, as again and again, before and since, has the justice of Bishop Doyle's remark (in a letter given in the Appendix) been too fatally illustrated: "They are pride and points of honour which keep us divided; not a love of Christian humility, charity, and truth."

It will be observed that our author habitually appeals for his Anglican authorities to the divines of the seventeenth rather than of the sixteenth century. The ground and justification of this preference is not far to seek. There can be no doubt, as Mr. Nicholas Pocock, the highest living authority on the subject, has pointed out, that the English Reformation, so far as it had a theological character at all, was not Lutheran, but Zwinglian.² Zwinglianism is stamped unmistakably on the letter and spirit of the Thirty-nine Articles, and inspired the various omissions, mutilations, and interpolations of the Second Prayer-Book of 1552, the First Book of Edward being little more than an expurgated translation of the old Latin service-books.³ But it must always be remembered that the English Reformation, as distinguished alike from

¹ Froude's *History of England*, vol. ix. p. 325.

² See, e.g. his *Principles of the Reformation*, and two papers on the Thirty-nine Articles in *Studies in Modern Problems*.

³ See below, chap. xviii. *ad init.*

the Scotch and the Continental, was not in the main a theological or religious movement at all, but a political one, and its theology bears the mark of political compromise, to use no harsher term. Lutheranism and Calvinism are definite and coherent religious systems, however erroneous; and those who differ most widely from the theological idiosyncrasies of their authors may respect the genius as well as the courage of Luther, the intellectual subtlety of Calvin, and even the coarse energy of John Knox. But I am only indorsing the verdict of those learned Anglicans who are best acquainted with the facts, when I say that it is impossible from any point of view, Catholic or Protestant, for well-informed persons to acquiesce in such an estimate of the work or career of the Re-forming Edwardian divines, of whom Cranmer may be considered the coryphæus, and whose theology for the most part was as little respectable as their lives. It was, to use Döllinger's words, from the Crown, and not from the people, as in Germany, that the ecclesiastical revolution in England received its impulse, rule, and form. "No man of first-rate eminence appeared—no Luther, or Calvin, or Melanchthon—to take the lead of the movement. Minds of an inferior order, possessed with the ideas struck out at Wittemberg and Zurich, served as the instruments for naturalising those principles in England, and effecting the ecclesiastical changes."¹ A few more years of the Edwardian régime, under the auspices of Cranmer and Bucer, would have sufficed to make a clean sweep of every

¹ *Lectures on Reunion of the Churches*, p. 104.

vestige of historical Christianity, that is of Catholicism, in the Church of England.¹

The Elizabethan Bishops, as a rule, and with some notable exceptions, were only less disreputable in their conduct, and not one whit more respectable theologians, than their predecessors under Edward.² Hooker stands alone in that age, *clarum et venerabile nomen*, as a connecting link between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though even he did not altogether escape infection from the evil influence of those who had gone before him. He had however, as Keble remarks, "his full share in training up for the next generation Laud, Hammond, Sanderson, and a multitude more such divines, *to which succession and series* (he adds), *humanly speaking, we owe it, that the Anglican Church continues at such a distance from that of Geneva, and so near to primitive truth and apostolical order.*"³ Still more emphatic is the testimony of another eminent Oxford divine, lately removed from

¹ During the later part of Edward's reign a new Prayer-Book and Ordinal—the latter substituting preaching ministers for bishops and priests—was actually drawn up by Cranmer and his associates, but they did not venture as yet to publish it, knowing how ill their previous religious innovations had been received in the country. We read at page 50 of *Troubles at Frankfort*, that "the Archbishop of Canterbury had drawn up a book of prayer a hundred times more perfect [*i.e.* Protestant] than this that we now have; the same could not take effect, for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy and Convocation, with other enemies." Meanwhile the language of Art. XXIII., which in its obvious sense implies that a "call" to the ministry from the congregation, according to the plan actually adopted at Frankfort, constituted the right to officiate, without any form of ordination at all, was intended to pave the way for the next book. The opportune death of the child, in whose name Cranmer, Somerset, and Northumberland had plundered and misgoverned the country, put a stop to all this.

² See Hallam's *Constitutional History*, vol. i. pp. 224, 225.

³ Keble's Preface to *Hooker's Works*, p. cvii.

amongst us, to the work accomplished—in spite, it may be added, of grave, though very intelligible, errors of policy—by the founder of the Caroline school, Archbishop Laud, to whose real intellectual and moral greatness it has been left to our own age to render tardy justice: “He stopped the English Church just in time, as she was rapidly going down-hill, and he saved all the Catholicism which the reign of Genevan influences had left her. There is no mistaking the tendencies of that period. That we have a Prayer-Book, an altar, even our Episcopacy itself, we may, humanly speaking, thank Laud. . . . That our Articles have not a Genevan sense tied to them, and are not an intolerable burden to the Church, is owing to Laud. He rescued them from the fast-tightening Calvinistic grasp, and left them, by his prefixed Declaration, open.¹ That any one of Catholic predilections can belong to the English Church is owing, so far as we can see, to Laud.”²

It is then to the Caroline prelates and divines that the Anglican Church owes its theology, almost its existence as a Church. They had inherited a position they would never have voluntarily chosen, and did their best, under terrible disadvantages, to improve it.

¹ The Declaration prefixed by Charles I. in 1628.

² Mozley's *Historical and Theological Essays*, vol. i. p. 227. Were it not for the peculiarly Whig formation of his mind, which rendered him incapable of appreciating any type of moral greatness not running within the “blue and yellow” lines, it would be strange to find a writer of Macaulay's acuteness caricaturing Laud with an ignorant and even stupid intolerance, which could hardly be outdone by the wildest Cameronian engaged on the character of a “Prelatist,” or the fiercest Inquisitor drawing a picture of a relapsed heretic.

From the nature of the case, their work was reactionary and reconstructive: "to gather up the fragments that remained." And it was owing to this religious revival, or counter-Reformation—to adopt a happy phrase of Ranke's—that by the end of the seventeenth century, in the words of a modern historian who has made the religious aspects of history one of his specialities, "except under very peculiar and abnormal circumstances, no other body had so firm and steady a hold on the affections of the people" as the clergy, of whom he proceeds to tell us that fully nine-tenths were High Churchmen, as well as the great body of the country gentry and the poor.¹ To the Caroline school, therefore, on every account, the author of an *Eirenicon* would naturally turn, in preference to the school or rather the rabble which preceded them; first, because they were avowedly seekers after unity, not stirrers-up of strife; and secondly, because they therefore made it their business to construct a positive and dogmatic theology, whereas the zeal of their predecessors had been concentrated on the effort to destroy one. Nor did they give indirect evidence only of their desire for reunion. It may be almost said to supply the keynote of the writings of men like Andrewes, Montague, Laud, Bramhall, Hammond, and Thorndyke. "It would be impossible," says Döllinger, "to commend the unity of the Church more eloquently and emphatically than, *e.g.* Hammond has done, who regards it as the noblest gift of God, the grace above all graces, the duty above all duties, the fulness of heavenly joy."

¹ Lecky's *England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. pp. 59, 87.

The same writer adds that the English Bishops told Panzani, who was sent by the Pope in 1634 to inquire into the state of religion in this country, that what hindered the union of the English and Roman Churches was the combined and obstinate resistance of the Puritans and the Jesuits.¹

For direct negotiations were carried on during the reign of Charles I., though not publicly, between the Holy See and the English Government and Bishops. Father Leander, an English Benedictine, was sent by Urban VIII. in 1632, and Father Panzani, an Oratorian of Arezzo, in 1634, with the express sanction of the King, conveyed through Sir Francis Windebank, Secretary of State, to report on the condition of the English Roman Catholics and of the Established Church. They have left their testimony on record, and it is very remarkable. Father Leander, whose communications with Archbishop Laud are frequently mentioned in the State Papers, reported that union "seemeth possible enough, if the points were discussed in an assembly of moderate men, without contention or desire of victory, but out of a sincere desire of Christian union."² He added that "in the greater number of the articles of faith the English Protestants of the Established Church are truly orthodox." "They agree in all the doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation and true Deity of our Blessed Saviour, in the points of Providence, predestination, justification, necessity of good works, co-operation of free-will with the grace of God. They

¹ *Lectures on Reunion of the Churches*, pp. 120, 121.

² *Clarendon's State Papers*, vol. i. p. 208 (Oxford ed., 1767).

admit the four first General Councils, the three authentic Symbols of the Apostles, Nice or Constantinople, and of St. Athanasius, as they are received in the Roman Church; they reverence the primitive Church and unanimous consent of the ancient Fathers, and all traditions and ceremonies which can be sufficiently proved by testimony of antiquity; they admit a settled Liturgy, taken out of the Roman Liturgy, distinction of orders, bishops, priests, and deacons, in distinct habits from the laity: and divers other points in which no transmarine Protestants do agree.”¹ He also spoke of the Church of England retaining the same external appearance of the ecclesiastical hierarchy as in Catholic times, and “a form of conferring orders which agrees in great part with the forms prescribed by the Roman Pontifical.”² And he thought it “very convenient that the Pope be dealt with not to vex moderate Catholics by censures or disgraces, since their end is to please God and the King, and promote the union of the Catholic religion, and the means employed by them are in their conscience lawful, and allowed of in other Catholic States.”³

Panzani, who replaced Leander two years later, and was subsequently made Bishop of Mileto, gives testimony to the same effect. He was received very favourably by the King himself, and he mentions in a letter to Cardinal Barberini, of February 16, 1635, that after

¹ Clarendon's *State Papers*, vol. i. p. 207; quoted in C. Butler's *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*, p. 2.

² *Ibid.* p. 197. It must be borne in mind that this favourable judgment refers to the Ordinal of Edward VI., then still in use, not to the revised and improved form of 1662.

³ *Ibid.* p. 209.

hearing a sermon against schism from one of his famous preachers, his Majesty had been heard to say "that he would willingly have parted with one of his hands rather than such a schism (as that produced by the Reformation) should have happened," and that, on being warned by one of his courtiers to speak softly on so delicate a topic, the King at once repeated, "I say it again: I wish I had rather lost one of my hands."¹ Panzani had several interviews with Sir Francis Windebank, Secretary of State, a friend of Laud's, and with Bishop Montague of Chichester. The former told him that, "if we had neither Jesuits nor Puritans in England, an union might easily be effected," to which Panzani replied, that although the Jesuits were looked on as a learned body, who had been very serviceable to the Church of Rome, "yet it is not improbable but His Holiness would sacrifice their interest in the prospect of so fair an acquisition."² Bishop Montague assured Panzani, at their first interview, that both the Archbishops, with the Bishop of London (Juxon), and several others of the Episcopate, and a great number of the learned inferior clergy, were favourable to an union of the Churches, and were ready to concede to Rome "a supremacy, *purely spiritual*," for "there was no other method of ending controversies than by having recourse to some centre of ecclesiastical unity;" and he proposed that moderate men should be chosen as deputies

¹ *Memoirs of Panzani*, translated and edited, with Introduction, by Rev. J. Berington, p. 135. The work itself, as well as the Introduction, by a Catholic priest of acknowledged learning and piety, well deserves the attention of all who are interested in the cause of reunion.

² *Ibid.* p. 163; cf. pp. 244, 245. Panzani's letters to Rome are full of complaints of the Jesuits.

on either side to confer on the subject. On reporting this interview to his superiors at Rome, Panzani was directed to convey to the Bishop their satisfaction at learning his pacific dispositions, and to exhort him to continue the good work he had begun, as also to gain further information about the English Bishops, and to assure them that the Pope "would make no unreasonable demands, but content himself with the essentials of his primacy, and such privileges as were annexed to it *jure divino*." Cardinal Barberini personally expressed himself warmly on the subject, saying that nothing would be more agreeable to him than that an union should be effected while he was at the head of affairs. In subsequent interviews Montague told Panzani that Archbishop Laud was entirely of his own mind in the matter, but thought caution necessary, and that only three Bishops, Durham, Salisbury, and Exeter (Morton, Davenant, and Hall), were decidedly opposed to the scheme.¹ The author of the *Memoirs*, that is Panzani himself, adds that there was a strong inclination for union among many of the Catholic laity, as, *e.g.* the Earl of Arundel, as well as among the Anglican bishops and clergy, but "several thinking persons speculated, not much amiss, that it would be retarded by the regulars, . . . and the Jesuits were chiefly apprehended in this respect."² In one of his last letters from England to Cardinal

¹ *Memoirs of Panzani*, pp. 237-246. Laud mentions in his Diary (quoted by Lingard, *Eng. Hist.*, vol. x. p. 4, note) the offer of a Cardinal's Hat, twice repeated, on his promotion to the Primacy, and his answer shows, not that he was indisposed to the idea of reunion, but that he was not prepared for unconditional submission.

² *Ibid.* p. 249.

Barberini, July 16, 1636, he says, "he is content to grow grey in the drudgery towards accomplishing the affair of the union."

The year before Panzani reached England appeared the *Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ*, by Sancta Clara, formerly known as Christopher Davenport, an Oxford convert, who had joined the Franciscan Order at Ypres, in 1617, and took the name in religion of Father Francis of St. Clare. After the re-establishment of the English Franciscan province in 1629 he returned to this country, and was appointed one of the chaplains of the Queen Henrietta Maria. He appears to have been frequently in communication with Archbishop Laud, Bishop Montague, Dr. (afterwards Bishop) Cosin, and others of the same school, though Laud himself was evidently rather shy of him—probably on prudential grounds—if we may judge from his way of referring to the charge brought against him on this score at his trial.¹ The *Exposition* appeared in 1633, dedicated to Charles I.; it is commonly supposed to have formed the basis of the famous Tract xc., lately republished by its illustrious author in the second volume of his *Via Media*. Of the Thirty-nine Articles, Sancta Clara considers eighteen thoroughly orthodox, and two—the eleventh and twelfth—concerned with mere logomachies. The remaining nineteen, which he examines in detail, he holds to be, as it has been expressed in our own day, "patient, but not ambitious, of a Catholic interpretation."² His comment

¹ See Laud's *History of My Troubles*, p. 430, and *Autobiography*, Oxford ed., pp. 375, 376.

² These are Articles 6, 9, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31,

on the thirty-sixth Article is an elaborate defence of the sufficiency of the Edwardian Ordinal. When attempts were made to get the book condemned at Rome, the King instructed Captain A. Brett, who was sent there as agent to the Queen, to use his influence to prevent any such step being taken, and in fact it was not condemned.¹ Panzani used his influence in the same direction, but was opposed as usual by the Jesuits. After the Restoration, Sancta Clara was appointed theologian and one of the principal chaplains of Charles II.'s Queen. He appears to have been highly esteemed in his own Order, in which he four times held the responsible office of English Provincial, and generally both in his own Church and among Anglicans. He was the author of no less than eighteen theological or religious works, of which that on the Thirty-nine Articles stands second in order of publication. His long and honoured career closed in 1680, when he died at Somerset House at the advanced age of eighty-two, and was buried in the chapel of the Savoy Hospital, having earned in no common measure the Beatitude pronounced on the peacemakers.

After the Puritan episode of the Commonwealth, and still more after the fresh impulse given to the Protestant element in the Church of England by the blundering impolicy of James II., and its result in the Revolution of 1688, it was natural that Anglicans should be too fully occupied with the domestic diffi-

32, 35, 36, 37. Tract xc. examines Articles 6, 11, 12, 13, 19, 21, 22, 25, 28, 31, 32, 35, 37. Sancta Clara's *Exposition* was republished in 1865 with a Translation, Introduction, and interesting sketch of the author's life, by the Rev. Dr. Lee.

¹ See Clarendon *State Papers*, vol. i. p. 171.

culty of Nonconformist opposition to have much leisure or disposition to enter on the broader question of Catholic union. It was much that in the revision of 1662 they were able not only to hold their own, but to introduce several important improvements in detail into the Ordinal and Prayer-Book, which had remained till then nearly as Cranmer and Bucer had left them more than a century before. There are said to have been no less than four hundred and fifty discourses on alterations of the Liturgy published during the reign of James II., and the cry for "comprehension," in the sense of lowering the doctrinal and ritual standard to the level of Dissenting requirements, of course waxed louder under his successor. The great body of the clergy were decidedly adverse to such a policy, but it was favoured by the class of prelates and divines who rose to power under William III. and the Georges,—men like Tillotson, Kidder, Hoadly, Prideaux, and Burnet. A scheme was actually framed for the purpose by a Royal Commission in the first year of William III.'s reign, and submitted to Convocation; but the Lower House had the discernment to perceive, what was indeed pretty clearly implied in the royal message, that it was virtually a plea for sinking the Anglican Church to the level of omniogenous Protestantism, and they refused even to discuss it. Macaulay admits that a disruption of the Church would have been the inevitable result of its acceptance.¹ In 1701 appeared the treatise,

¹ *History of England*, vol. iii. p. 494. Burnet says the same: *History of His Own Times*, vol. ii. p. 544, ed. 1840.

to which our author refers in chapter xvii., and which is believed to have partly at least suggested his own by way of a rejoinder. It is entitled *An Essay towards Comprehension, or a Persuasion to Unity among Protestants, offered to the Consideration of the Two Houses of Parliament*, and consists of 239 pages; the anonymous writer describing himself as "a Lover of Peace and Unity." Another edition, however, or rather a fresh issue, for no hint was given of the treatise having appeared before, was published in 1718, in which the writer styled himself "a Divine of the Church of England;" both editions purporting to be put forth with the consent of several "ministers and others of both persuasions." Besides the proposal mentioned by our author, of admitting Dissenting ministers to officiate without any fresh ordination, several changes or bracketings of the Prayer-Book are recommended, and a mixed assembly of Anglican and Dissenting divines is to consult as to further alterations. Three years later, in 1704, appeared the *Essay for Catholic Communion*, also without any author's name. I have already said that the treatise bears no internal evidence of Nonjuring authorship, but the external evidence against it is even more decisive. The Nonjurors, who were very anti-Roman in their sympathies, seem to have feared they might be credited with the authorship, and therefore proceeded at once to attack the work with no little asperity. No less than three replies from members of that party appeared in 1705. The least acrimonious, according to a writer in the *Union Review*, was by

Spinckes, who, however, on his title-page, describes the author as "a *pretended* minister of the Church of England," and his method of reconciling the Churches as "fallacious and impracticable." Another reply, anonymously published, is understood to be by the writer referred to as "the Reverend Mr. St." in chapter xvii.,¹ who professes in his title to have "detected the whole mystery and artifice," and "exposed and defeated the secret design of the work," which he ascribes to a writer who had long since "been reconciled to the Church of Rome." He is supposed to refer to a Mr. Joshua Bassett, who was Master of Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge, from 1686 to 1688, and is said to have become a convert to the Roman Catholic Church in 1687.² Spinckes adopts Mr. Stephens's account of the authorship, on his authority, but adds no independent testimony of his own. Both these treatises are written—as our author's assuredly is not—in a style which vividly recalls the controversial amenities

¹ This is quite clear from internal evidence. His full name is Edward Stephens.

² The writer of an article on "Corporate Reunion" in an early number of the now extinct *Union Review* (1863), says that "in citing the title of the work, Mr. Stephens *betrays the name of the writer, Mr. Bassett*," and he proceeds to inquire what Mr. Bassett can have been intended. I have read through this reply, which is very short, in the British Museum copy, and can find no trace of any name, but it is very likely that Joshua Bassett is the person referred to. As however Mr. Stephens gives no reason for his view beyond his own personal conviction, and is evidently inspired by an intensely bitter personal animosity towards the writer (whoever he be), on whom he desires to father the authorship, and thereby of course to fix a charge of deliberate imposture, I cannot think much weight is to be attached to his unsupported testimony. His own theological position may be estimated by the amazing statement on his concluding page: "The Greek Communion I take to be *the only true Catholic Communion in the world*." He will not even admit the validity of orders in the Western Church.

of an age when *putidissimus iste* was the darling sobriquet hurled at each other by rival scholars and divines. A third reply appeared the same year, under the title of *Concordia Discors*, by "a Presbyterian of the Church of England." This last I have not seen, but it is clear from the account of it given by the *Union* reviewer that the writer was also a Nonjuror.¹

The question thus arises, whether a Mr. Bassett, and, if so, what Mr. Bassett, was the author of the present work?² A contemporary London incumbent of that name, William Bassett, rector of St. Swithin's, who is mentioned in Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses* as a member of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, is known as the author of *An Answer to the Brief History of the Unitarians*, and is said by Birch, in his *Life of Archbishop Tillotson*, to have also published *Two Letters on Alterations in the Liturgy* and a *Vindication* of them in 1689.³ The writer in the *Union Review* assumes on this ground that he cannot have been the author of the present work, which does not appear to me at all necessarily to follow. There is no inherent improbability in a divine, who had written in 1689 in favour of comprehension of Dissenters, writing fifteen years afterwards in favour of Catholic union; and the language of the prefatory chapter, where the author speaks of his inclinations having first led him to consider the

¹ There is no copy of this tract in the British Museum.

² In the Brit. Mus. Catalogue the alternative names of Joshua Bassett and Thomas Dean are affixed to the work in print, both being marked with a query. No copy of the *Letters on Alterations in the Liturgy* mentioned by Birch is to be found there.

³ Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, 2d ed., p. 194.

case of Dissent at home, would quite bear out such an idea. His tone throughout, as has already been observed, is that of a man of "moderate" rather than "extreme" views, who is profoundly impressed with the manifold evils of division, and sincerely anxious to promote the reunion of all believing Christians in one fold, but who has the sense to perceive, and the courage to insist, that little progress can ever be made towards such a consummation by any scheme that ignores the largest and most influential portion of Christendom. Moreover, it is very possible that his opinions may have developed during the intervening fifteen years in a Catholic direction, and his own language in some passages almost implies as much. That the general tendency among the English clergy of the period was in that direction is certain, for we have already seen that in Queen Anne's reign the great majority of them were High Churchmen. On the other hand, it seems to me, in the absence of any definite proof to the contrary—and I cannot accept the angry personal vituperation of an avowed and interested partisan, who neither mentions his adversary's name nor his own, as any proof at all—simply incredible that a convert of several years' standing should have been the author of a work which would thus not only be a deliberate imposture from beginning to end—and an imposture garnished, as must strike every reader, with a copious array of detailed and explicit falsehoods—but also one which could not fail to be instantly detected and exposed, as the writer's name was *ex hypothesi* known to one at least

of his bitterest assailants. Nor is it likely in that case that the work would have made, as it certainly did, a considerable impression at the time, while three later editions of it have appeared at different periods since.¹ On the whole then, and under correction of any further information that may come to light, I am disposed to assign the authorship of the work, if it is by a Mr. Bassett, to the rector of St. Swithin's, and failing him to some namesake of his unknown to fame. It may be added that, should this conjecture prove correct, the author would remarkably typify in his own person that peculiarity of the Church of England to which De Maistre calls attention in a well-known passage, as "touching us (Catholics) with one hand, while it touches with the other those we cannot touch."

And now the course of our inquiry has tided us over the boundaries of the seventeenth century into what has been styled by one of the ablest of its modern apologists *saeculum rationalisticum*, an age confessedly of religious apathy and indifference, "whose poetry was without romance, whose philosophy was without insight, and whose public men were without

¹ First came the carefully executed Dublin reprint of 1781, which has been used for the text of this edition. A third edition, called a second, appeared in 1801, of which there is a copy in the British Museum, and a fourth, calling itself a third—of which there is no copy there—in 1812, both of which are dedicated by "A Lover of Christian Peace and Union and a Loyal United Briton" to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and the Commons of the United Kingdom; and the edition of 1812 has also a short preface advocating Catholic Emancipation. Both these last profess to be literal reprints of the original edition, and both are, to say the least, very slovenly productions, evidently from the same editor—a very incompetent one—who disclaims all knowledge of the date even of the first edition, and of course knows nothing about the authorship.

character ; an age of 'light without love,' whose very merits were of the earth, earthy ;" when "the title of Locke's treatise, *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, may be said to have been the solitary thesis of Christian theology in England."¹ I do not forget the splendid services, in their respective spheres, of Butler and Pearson, in saying that it was on the whole an age supremely ignorant alike and disdainful of the first rudiments of Catholic theology, when Christians seem to have thought that their sole obligation towards Divine Revelation was to "prove" it ; an age whose self-complacent theological shallowness is aptly summed up in the portentous paradox of one of its leading prelates and divines, that "the image of God in which man was at first created lay in the faculty of reason only," and its ecclesiastical *ἡθός* in the primacy of the archiepiscopal fop Cornwallis, while Christian earnestness was turned adrift with Wesley and Whitfield, to issue in an organised revolt against the Church it was forbidden to defend. That is not the period to which one would naturally turn for signs of a reaction in effort or in heart towards Catholic unity. Yet there was something to provoke such a reaction in the very circumstances of the imminent collapse of faith. To cite once more the writer already quoted : "The old and venerated authority had been broken by the Reformation. The new authority of the Anglican establishment had existed in theory only, and never in fact, and the Revolution had crushed the theory, which was now confined to a

¹ Rev. M. Pattison, in *Essays and Reviews*, pp. 254, 258, 6th edit.

small band of Nonjurors."¹ The Nonjurors themselves seem to have been troubled by their state of isolation, and they sought a remedy in making overtures, not to Rome—the infatuated policy of James II. had made them very suspicious of all advances from that quarter,—but to the Orthodox Eastern Church. It was hardly in the nature of things that such an enterprise should succeed. All experience confirms the justice of the axiom laid down by Grotius, that Protestants will never be able to come to an agreement among themselves till they come to an agreement with Rome.² And it is still less likely that communions so widely diverse in their antecedents, their spirit, their geographical position, and their nationality, as the Anglican and Eastern Churches, should ever unite except round some common centre.

However, negotiations were carried on for some years between the Scottish and Nonjuring Bishops and the Eastern Patriarchs, originating in the visit of Arsenius, Metropolitan of Thebais, to England in 1716. Had the Nonjurors risen to the doctrinal level of their Caroline predecessors, something might perhaps have been achieved. But it is clear from the statement transmitted through Arsenius to the Czar Peter, and referred by him to the Patriarchs, that they made difficulties about points like the Invocation of Saints and the Real Presence,³ where men like Forbes, Thorn-

¹ Rev. M. Pattison, in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 290, 6th edit.

² See *Rivet. Apologet. Discuss.*, *ad fin.*

³ The Synod of Bethlehem in 1672, having occasion to vindicate the traditional faith of the Eastern Church against the Protestantism of Cyril Lucar, had approved the term Transubstantiation, *μερουσίωσις*.

dyke, and Montague would have seen none. The negotiations were brought to an abrupt termination by the death of the Czar Peter, who had favoured the scheme. About the same time a similar attempt was made by Barchmann Wuytiers, Archbishop of Utrecht, according to a plan suggested by some doctors of the Sorbonne, who took occasion from the residence of the Czar Peter in Paris to forward a document to the Eastern prelates by his hands. Their reply was unfortunately addressed to the infamous Cardinal Dubois—who will come before us again in the same capacity of a hinderer of peace presently,—and he promptly quashed the proceedings. They were renewed in 1627, when Archbishop Barchmann received the Princess Galitzin, wife of Prince Dolgorouki, into the Latin Church, and sent a chaplain back with her to Moscow, with full powers to negotiate with the Eastern prelates, who obtained the blessing of the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles, on his way, and met with a very favourable reception in Russia. Here again the death of the Czar in 1725 brought matters to a premature end, through the personal enmity of the Empress Anne, who succeeded him, to the Dolgorouki family—another out of many examples of the personal or political jealousies which have so often blasted the fairest hopes of peace.¹

About the same time overtures were made by some doctors of the Sorbonne, acting with the concurrence of Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, to the English Primate, Archbishop Wake. This was in

¹ See Neale's *Jansenist Church of Holland*, pp. 269-271.

1717, the year after Wake became Archbishop, and thirteen years after the death of Bossuet. More than thirty years before, when residing in France, he had carefully studied Bossuet's famous *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*, which appears to have suggested his own *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*. A long private correspondence now followed between the Archbishop on the one side, and M. Beauvoir, Du Pin, and De Girardin on the other,—De Girardin having first addressed the Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne on the subject, before whom Wake's letters were placed, and who seem to have received them very favourably, saying that "the foundations of concord had been laid by him, and they must make their contribution towards so beautiful a work." The correspondents on both sides agreed that the Churches were not so far apart as to preclude reunion, and that the points of doctrinal difference were few, and easily capable of adjustment. Du Pin drew up a *Commonitorium*, which examines the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles, of which he approved twenty-three absolutely as they stand;¹ and the rest he was willing to admit with explanations, which he suggests, of the doctrines contained or censured in them. Wake did not consider that the question of Transubstantiation need present any difficulty. Both Du Pin and De Girardin professed themselves satisfied with the Primate's vindication of the Anglican succession, as to which indeed Bossuet has left on record his judgment to the same effect. Du Pin observes to Wake, on reading Forbes's

¹ These are Articles 1-5, 7-9, 12, 15-18, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 32-34, 38, 39.

Considerationes Modestæ, a work frequently cited by our author, that "the Bishop seems to be of the same mind as you and I; for the whole subject of the work turns on this, to show that the controversies between us may easily be settled, if only the fairer theologians are heard on both sides, if dictating is avoided, *and we are led, not by party spirit, but by love of seeking the truth.*" The correspondence is full of interest, and seemed at one time likely to lead to some practical result. Beauvoir wrote to the Archbishop, in February 1719, that "the whole city (of Paris) rings of an union, and many openly declare that they wish it." But here again the negotiations were traversed by the wretched Dubois, who had just obtained the Archbishopric of Cambrai, and was soon to pass to his account, but was still busily occupied in scheming for a Red Hat on the brink of the grave. And the death of Du Pin early in 1719, the changed attitude of the French Government, and the reviving power of the Jesuits in France, who have shown themselves always and everywhere the standing opponents of all projects of reunion, brought the matter to an end, greatly to Archbishop Wake's regret, which is warmly expressed in his last letter to Du Pin, dated Lambeth, May 1, 1719.¹ Before it reached Paris Du Pin was dead.

¹ Some account of this correspondence will be found in Pusey's *Eirenicon*, pp. 210-236. Du Pin's comments on the Thirty-nine Articles, and several of Archbishop Wake's letters to him and M. Beauvoir, will be found in Appendix III. to vol. v. of Maclaine's translation of Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*. It must be borne in mind, in reading Maclaine's remarks on the correspondence, that they come from a writer of Mosheim's theological school, who of course regards the matter from a very unappreciative point of view.

Two or three sentences, translated from the Latin original, shall be given here : " In dogmas, as you have candidly proposed them, we do not much differ ; in Church government less ; in fundamentals, whether regarding doctrine or discipline, hardly at all. From these beginnings how easy was the advance to concord, if only our minds were disposed to peace ! But this does not suit the secular princes, and greatly displeases the enemies of union ; and God will not perhaps grant us the happiness of bringing about this union. . . . Meanwhile no one can prevent our embracing each other as brethren, and members of the same mystical body."¹

From thenceforth nothing was heard of reunion in England—where the received theology was taking its tone from a mitred Socinian, who for forty-six years presided successively over four different dioceses,—till the eighteenth century had run its dreary course, and the catastrophe which closed it had rudely startled the religious world of Europe out of that "slumber, not of rest," in which it had so long indulged. What meanwhile had been the course of religious thought and life in Germany ? We have seen how slowly and reluctantly either Catholics or Protestants could persuade themselves to acquiesce in a state of chronic separation, and how, as late as 1648, the hope of reunion found formal expression in the terms of the very document which recognised the fact. Only thirty years earlier the last conference with this object had been held at Prague, but it led to no result. Now, after the terrible

¹ The original is in Maclaine's *Mosheim*, vol. v. p. 167.

exhaustion of the 'Thirty Years' War, patriotic no less than religious motives combined to induce a strong desire for a peace which could only be durable and complete if the main cause of political estrangement was removed. But it would be a great mistake to imagine that the craving for unity was chiefly a political one. The evils of a divided Christendom pressed heavily on men's minds, and not least—as has been already observed—on the minds of laymen. The names of Cassander, Grotius, Leibnitz, Duræus, Hall, Calixtus, Molanus, may suffice to remind us of this; and, indeed, it is a remark of Döllinger's that the whole religious literature of the laity (in Germany), from the seventeenth to far into the eighteenth century, is penetrated with a profound dissatisfaction at the prevalent Protestant teaching.¹ Towards the close of the seventeenth century conversions to Catholicism became frequent, including that of Queen Christina, the accomplished daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, who resigned her throne for the purpose. Calixtus insisted on the Vincentian rule, as interpreted by the consentient teaching of the first five centuries. Grotius went much beyond him. And towards the end of the century a fresh impulse was given to the eirenic movement on the Catholic side by the accession to the Papacy (1675) of the pious and enlightened Innocent XI., who was at once engaged in earnest conflict with the Jesuits and their lax system of casuistry, and made such direct advances towards the Protestants as to award his full sanction to the negotiations of Spinola,

¹ Döllinger's *Lectures on Reunion of the Churches*, p. 85.

which were based on the offer of extensive concessions. But this sanction had to be kept secret, as usual from a political motive; the French Cardinals at Rome, acting under inspiration of their Government, were opposed to all schemes of reunion.

The name of Royas de Spinola is less known than it deserves to be. He was a Spaniard, born in Holland, who came to Germany as confessor to the Emperor Leopold's wife, and was made Bishop, first of Jena in Croatia, and afterwards of Neustadt near Vienna. He was made a Cardinal, but refused the Archbishopric of Mechlin, that he might devote himself exclusively to the work of reunion, which was the leading idea and continuous labour of his life, carried on with indomitable patience and perseverance under pressure of constant illness and frequent opposition or discouragement. He visited Rome six times; he travelled from Court to Court, visiting and corresponding with princes, statesmen, and divines. Leibnitz copied and preserved his brief summary of these transactions, which contains no word of reproach or complaint, but such entries as the following tell their own tale: "*ipse (Spinola) ex sciaticâ pertinaci lecto affixus non nisi lateri sinistro innixus ad reliquas aulas in sellâ manibus portari voluit.*" He had full powers from both the Emperor and the Pope, and entertained for a time confident hopes of ultimate success. He clearly perceived, as have others who took up the task in earnest, that existing differences arose chiefly from want of mutual charity and patience in explaining difficulties. "The difference between the Roman and Protestant Churches is not in funda-

mentals (*in fundamento salutis*), but in additions only." He hoped of course that the Protestants would eventually accept the decrees of Trent, but he was authorised to negotiate on the basis of a previous union, under appeal to a future Council, on which Leibnitz afterwards insisted; and twenty-five propositions, which he drew up and took to Rome, embodying the views of the leading Protestant divines on justification and other controverted points, were sanctioned *post gravissimas consultationes* by the Pope and Cardinals.¹ Here again, as so often happens, were Bishop Doyle's words verified: "The failure was due more to princes than to priests, more to State policy than to a difference of belief." Louis XIV. traversed the negotiation for his own selfish ends, and forced the hand of the Pope. But such a life as Spinola's cannot have been lived in vain; the blessing of the peacemakers is not for themselves alone. In 1695, while still intent on his lifelong work, he was called to his reward.²

Foremost on the Protestant side in these transactions stood Molanus (Gerhard), a disciple of the school of Calixtus, and the mighty genius of Leibnitz. Leibnitz was eventually brought, through the influence of Anna Gonzaga, wife of Edward, Count Palatine, into the famous correspondence with Bossuet, which must always possess a more than merely

¹ Leibnitz obtained from Spinola the authentic documents proving this fact.

² I am partly indebted for this account of Spinola's labours to two very interesting articles on "Leibnitz's Letters on Reunion" in the *Contemporary Review* for May and August 1867, by the Rev. S. Stead. They are written from a Protestant standpoint, but in a candid and devout tone, and contain a great deal of valuable information.

historic or literary value, not only from its intrinsic interest, but still more as laying down a plan of reunion grounded in the main on the negotiations of Spinola, and which therefore had been admitted on both sides to supply a practicable basis of agreement. One of his arrangements, indeed, could never have been accepted as it stood, viz. the recognition of the orders of the existing Lutheran clergy, though for the future the Roman rite were to be observed. For, whatever question may be raised about the English Episcopate, there could be no doubt that the German Protestants had broken, and deliberately broken, the line of apostolic succession, when they might easily have preserved it, had they cared to do so, as some of the Catholic Bishops joined them early in the movement.¹ Leibnitz openly regretted their perversity, and attempts were actually made more than once to get the defect supplied from England. But this matter in itself would certainly not have proved difficult of adjustment.² Other concessions demanded for the Protestants were the use of the chalice and the optional marriage of the clergy. But the great point insisted on by Leibnitz, and strongly opposed by Bossuet, was the provisional suspension of the decrees of Trent, as far as they were concerned, under appeal to a future Œcumenical Council. It does not seem very clear on what doctrinal ground so much

¹ See Döllinger's *Lectures on Reunion of the Churches*, pp. 80 *sqq.*

² It had been arranged, I think, by Spinola, that the existing Lutheran ministers should be at once re-ordained and retain their positions; but I cannot put my finger on the reference. Certainly this was Bossuet's suggestion, and he was willing that they should keep their wives.

stress was laid on this point, especially after Leibnitz had expressly asserted that on the doctrine of justification, which was the head and front of Luther's contention against the Church, "there remains no real and essential difference." However, Spinola had been authorised to treat with the Protestants on this understanding, and Leibnitz appealed to the example of the Council of Basle, which united with the Bohemians, while they rejected the Council of Constance.¹ A far better example might have been found in the Council of Florence, where all questions in dispute with the Greeks were re-examined in common *de novo*, without any reference to the previous decisions of the second Council of Lyons; and indeed, had the reunion of East and West proved permanent, the Council of Florence was to have been acknowledged as the eighth Œcumenical, passing over all the mediæval synods, since the division of East and West.² But the stern uncompromising spirit of Bossuet in his later years had little in common with the tender charity of Spinola or Innocent XI.; his heart seems never to have been thoroughly in the correspondence with Leibnitz, and he showed himself more intent throughout on argumentative triumph than on furthering any practical result. Moreover, the Erastian side of his Gallicanism led him to identify himself with the narrow and

¹ He also pointed out that France did not recognise the fifth Lateran Council, or Italy the Council of Basle.

² It is actually called *Octavum Concilium* in the first Latin edition of the Acts, published at Rome in 1526, and again in Cardinal Pole's *Reformatio Angliæ*, a collection of statutes made by him in his legatine capacity, and published at Rome in 1666.

selfish policy of his master, who, as was intimated before, had no desire to see Germany united in one faith, and no idea of conversion, except by the Mahometan method of dragonnades.

On the other hand, Leibnitz and those in whose name he spoke—for it must be remembered that he was by no means acting as a mere individual—were ready, if these concessions were allowed, to acknowledge “a primacy of order, dignity, and direction over the Universal Church” in the See of Rome, and to honour and respect the Pope as “supreme Patriarch and chief Bishop of the Catholic Church.” Leibnitz puts this admission on the same obviously reasonable ground, which had been accepted by Melanchthon,¹ to whom he appeals, and strenuously urged by Grotius, that “in every college and society of men there is need of a director.” He added that in this matter Molanus agreed with him. And surely so much is manifest, apart from all disputed questions of divine or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, as a mere matter of common sense. No community or state of any size, secular or religious, least of all an international and world-wide community, can possibly be held together without some common head, whether it be, as in Russia, an absolute, or, as in England, a constitutional Sovereign, or, as in the United States, an elected President. It was at a very early period of English history that

¹ Melanchthon says: “Hanc canonicam *Politiam*, ut ego existimo, nemo prudens improbat neque improbare debet, si intra suos fines maneat, hoc est, si Pontifex et Episcopi non abutantur auctoritate sua . . . prodesset enim meo iudicio Monarchia illa Romani Pontificis ad hoc, ut *doctrinæ consensus retineretur in multis nationibus*.”—*Respons. ad Bellarmin.*, cited, with approval, by Grotius, *De Antichr.*, Opp. Theol. tom. iii. p. 483.

the monarchy superseded the heptarchy, and the subsequent unions of Scotland and Ireland with England were natural applications of the same essential principle. But the Catholic Church, as it is represented in Scripture, and as it exists in fact, is a visible polity, state, empire—the supreme State, *Civitas Dei*.

All Church history proves this necessity of a visible centre of unity, though, of course, the precise nature and limits of the central authority are separate questions, to be decided on their own merits. If it be objected that the Eastern Church since the separation has recognised no Pope, the reply is that she has always, in theory at least, recognised a supreme Patriarchate at Constantinople; and if, for reasons too familiar to require being examined here, the Patriarchal authority has been feeble and inoperative, it is notorious that the whole theological and religious life of Eastern Christendom for a thousand years has been in a state of chronic stagnation, while in Russia, where during the last century it has been more active than elsewhere, the real centre of unity is placed, as the Russian Code expresses it, in “the autocratic authority (of the Czar), which acts by means of the Most Holy Governing Synod appointed by it.”¹ The same is true, in a lesser degree, of the English Church, where the royal supremacy supplies the principle of coherence. But it is a very noteworthy fact that the moment Anglicanism begins to realise or feel after an independent ecclesiastical life, binding the national

¹ See Tondini's *Pope of Rome and Eastern Popes*, p. 21. The Governing Synod was substituted by the Czar Peter for the Patriarch of Moscow, as the supreme authority in the Russian Church.

Church at home in one with the Colonial and other kindred communions beyond the four seas, it is at once compelled, from the necessity of the case, to find or form for itself a quasi-Papal central authority. In the words of a leading Church organ, it "*finds its natural Patriarchate at Canterbury*;"¹ and two Pan-Anglican Synods have accordingly been summoned in succession to assemble from all quarters of the globe round "the chair of St. Augustine," from which the Primate of all England addresses and presides over them. It has even been suggested that the title of Patriarch should be formally assigned to him, and it is abundantly clear that, if any regular system of combined synodical action were to be established, he would inevitably be called upon to discharge strictly patriarchal functions, whether the official title were given him or not. No more striking illustration could be afforded—the more instructive because wholly "undesigned"—of the necessity for a central authority. If the Anglican Communion throughout the world, in its present isolated condition, "*finds its natural patriarchate at Canterbury*," it is only reasonable to assume that a reunited Christendom, comprising all diversities of race, language, and national character, would find the natural as well as traditional seat of its primacy where Melancthon, Grotius, and Leibnitz were willing to acknowledge it—in the See of Rome.

On points of controverted doctrine, Leibnitz, like Spinola, considered that mutual explanations would

¹ *Church Quarterly*, July 1878, p. 356.

usually suffice, the most important explanation he required being the somewhat obvious one that the supreme worship of *latria*, declared by the Council of Trent (Sess. xiii.) to be due to our Lord in the holy Eucharist, "is given and entirely confined to Jesus Christ there present." This point is clearly brought out by our author in his section on Eucharistic adoration. To some questions, which would cause little difficulty now, he seems to have attached a very disproportionate importance, as, *e.g.* to the Tridentine canon of the Old Testament, which has not the remotest bearing on any doctrinal controversy.¹ But it was not on any doctrinal difficulties, as we have already seen, that the efforts of Leibnitz and the good intentions of Innocent XI. and Spinola were eventually wrecked. The grand hindrance was the policy of Louis XIV. There was indeed one serious drawback on the Protestant side, "the conceit about Antichrist," which had taken so strong a hold on the popular imagination that it could not easily be dislodged. It may serve to gauge to our own minds the potent "witchery," as a contemporary German theologian phrases it, of this strange delusion, so little intelligible to those who have never shared it, and so grotesquely defiant of all rational principles of exegesis, to recall Dr. Newman's startling avowal that "up to the year 1843"—that is, up to within two years of his actually joining the Roman Catholic Church—his "imagination

¹ Jahn, in commenting on the Tridentine canon, distinguishes the books called "apocryphal" by Protestants as "deutero-canonical."—*Introduction to Old Testament*, vol. i. sect. 30 ; cf. sect. 216.

was stained by the effects of this doctrine," though his reason and judgment had rejected it.¹ But Rome, as Döllinger points out, made herself partly responsible for the prolonged vitality of the idea, by maintaining the practice of religious persecution. While executions for heresy still continued at Rome, and Europe was ringing with the horrors following on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, "the people were sure," in spite of all critical impossibilities, "to think they saw the Papacy in the Apocalyptic woman drunk with the blood of the saints." Fénelon perfectly understood this when he refused to preach to the Huguenots till Louis had consented to withdraw his troops, remarking that, "when the missionaries and soldiers work side by side, new converts crowd to receive Communion," who would, under similar auspices, just as readily "abjure Christianity and accept the Koran;" and Clement XIV., one of the holiest and wisest pontiffs since the Reformation, understood and sorrowfully confessed it.² Leibnitz's last word, when for the present all hope seemed over, was that "reunion will yet take place, for it is the will of God: *fata viam invenient*." And it is pleasant to find Bossuet in his final letter to Leibnitz, of August 12, 1671, within three years of his death, giving utterance to

¹ *Apologia*, p. 7.

² "What a happy revolution would have been witnessed, if, instead of being persecuted, heretics had simply been entreated and adjured with all possible gentleness not to separate from the centre of unity; if their difficulties had been explained with kindness, their objections patiently listened to, and if, above all, they had been addressed, as religion itself speaks, without bitterness or pride."—*Lettere Interessanti di Clemente XIV.*, iv. 60.

a similar anticipation: "It must be hoped these things will have their effect some day, if not now." But for a long time after the collapse of what had seemed so promising an enterprise, nothing further was attempted, and the growth of rationalism on one side, and of Jesuit domination on the other, blotted out of men's minds the very thought and desire of unity.

Among the questions swept to the surface by the great revolutionary wave which passed over European society at the close of the last century was that of justice to Ireland, and especially of Catholic Emancipation. And thus, after a long reign of Protestant or sceptical indifference, the religious aspect of Catholicism was once again, however indirectly, forced on the attention of educated Englishmen. But there were those, among the ablest and most devout of the Irish Catholic hierarchy of the day, who were anxious to seize the opportunity for securing something better than a mere political success. Bishop Doyle, of Kildare and Leighlin—*facile princeps* among his episcopal brethren, and better known by his ordinary signature of "J. K. L."—addressed in May 1824 a letter on "the Union of the Churches" to Mr. Robinson, father of the present Lord Ripon, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and three years afterwards became Prime Minister.¹ This letter is so remarkable in itself, and for the tone of sentiment among both Catholics and Protestants which it illustrated or evoked, as to be well worth putting on record in a

¹ He was created Viscount Goderich in 1827, and Earl of Ripon in 1833.

work designed as an Eirenicon. I have therefore given the text complete in an Appendix.¹

The Bishop begins by stating that his letter was immediately occasioned by the sentiments Mr. Robinson was reported to have expressed in the House of Commons on Mr. Hume's motion about the Church Establishment in Ireland, with which he himself entirely agreed.² But there is good reason for believing that he did not come forward without the tacit concurrence at least of the Holy See, and the result proved that he was far from speaking for himself alone. Had the proposal appeared thirty or forty years later, after the influence of the Oxford move-

¹ See Appendix A. A great part of the letter will be found in Kirkpatrick's *Life, Times, and Correspondence of Bishop Doyle*, vol. i. pp. 321 *sqq.*, as also much interesting information connected with it, to which I am mainly indebted for what is said on the subject above.

² This appears to have been a mistake. On referring to Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates* (N.S., vol. xi. p. 568), I find that the statement was not made by Mr. Robinson, who took no part in the debate on Mr. Hume's motion, but by Mr. Robertson, whose speech is entirely occupied with urging "the union of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches," as quite feasible, and the best or only adequate method of restoring peace and tranquillity to Ireland. He dwells especially on the feasibility of this scheme having been maintained by the Bishop of Durham (Shute Barrington) in a Charge to his clergy. A long extract from this very remarkable Charge—reprinted in the preface to a *Book of Common Prayer*, published in 1815 by the Rev. P. Gandolphy, a Roman Catholic priest in London—is given in the appendix to my *Letter to F. Lockhart on Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon*, p. 130. The Bishop observes that the circumstances of Europe are more favourable than at any former period for the accomplishment of the work of reunion; that, if only he could live to see the foundations laid for such an union, it "would illuminate with consolation and joy the last hours of a long life" (he lived to the age of ninety-two), and, as Bishop Doyle said afterwards, that he could then depart with "the rapturous language of good old Simeon" on his dying lips. He adds, "May that Saviour, who has left us in the record of His Gospel His own anxious prayer for the union of His disciples, promote and prosper the blessed work of Catholic Union." What gives additional weight to these expressions is the fact that Bishop Barrington had written strongly in a former controversial work on the Protestant side.

ment of 1833 had penetrated the Anglican Church, it would undoubtedly, as Mr. Fitzpatrick observes, have met with a far wider and more cordial response on the other side. Yet even then a great impression was evidently produced both on Catholics and Protestants. Mr. Newenham, a Gloucestershire clergyman, took up the subject warmly, and had a long correspondence with the Bishop and with others about it. "Should the Churches of Rome and England ever be united," he wrote to the Bishop, "and should the united Church be distinguished by a complete restoration of true, unmixed, scriptural Christianity, apostolic and primitive rites, usages, discipline, and toleration, and should the worship of that Church combine the impressive solemnities of the Church of Rome with the instructive, sublime, and spiritual Liturgy of the Church of England, the missionary zeal of the former with the missionary means of the latter, infidelity and sectarianism would soon be confined within very narrow limits." Mr. Newenham went further, and proposed that Bishop Doyle and one of the English Vicars-Apostolic should select "ten of the more learned, pious, liberal-minded, and benevolent divines of their Church," to confer with an equal number of Anglican divines, to be chosen by "those truly venerable prelates the Bishops of Limerick and Lichfield" (Jebb and Ryder), on the points in dispute between the Churches,¹ taking Scripture, the decrees of General

¹ In a note, Mr. Newenham says that Bishop Jebb was "eminently conspicuous for erudition, piety, benevolence, and a disposition to think favourably of the religion of the Church of Rome," and that as little difference would be found between him and Fénelon in faith as in character. His

Councils, and the writings of the Fathers, as their standard of appeal ; and he thought that their conclusions would be accepted without hesitation by "a vast many solicitous, humble Christians of both Churches." Mr. Fitzpatrick adds regarding Bishop Jebb, that he was among the most learned and liberal divines of the Irish Established Church, and was respected and beloved by the Catholics generally ; on one occasion he "addressed the people after Mass from the altar of the Roman Catholic church of Murroe," and was heard with breathless attention. "The venerable Roman Catholic Bishop of Limerick (Dr. Ryan), while he conversed with him as a friend, honoured him as a Christian Bishop, and advised with him as fellow-labourers in the vineyard of their common Lord." On one of the last occasions when he was seen in the streets of Limerick, he was walking arm-in-arm with a Roman Catholic priest. During his last illness he was publicly prayed for in the Catholic churches, and at his funeral "the Roman Catholic clergy, with the venerable Bishop at their head, walked in the procession to the west door of the Cathedral arm-in-arm with their Protestant brethren." Charles Butler was his friend and frequent guest.¹ Mr. Jackson, Vicar of Armagh,

opinion of Bishop Ryder is quite borne out by what I have myself heard the late Mr. de Lisle say of him, who knew him intimately, viz. that he was a striking example of all "the endearing virtues of Christianity," and though popularly identified with the Evangelical school, was "remarkably sober-minded, conciliatory, quick of apprehension, open to conviction, and disposed to treat with the utmost deference the decisions of pious and learned divines."

¹ Bishop Doyle, in a letter to Mr. Newenham, speaks of him as "an object of veneration to every person in the empire."

wrote a book on the scheme suggested in Bishop Doyle's letter, and it was referred to by the well-known Archbishop Magee of Dublin in his next Charge to his clergy. Dr. Sadleir, Provost of Trinity College, sought an interview with Archbishop Murray, to express his earnest desire for a reconciliation of the Churches. After the Bishop's death there appeared, in 1838, *A Letter to the Right Hon. A. R. Blake on the Union of the Churches*. In 1842, a volume of sermons, entitled *A Union between the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches rendered Practicable*, was published by Mr. Cumming of Dublin, and was followed by the work of another Anglican clergyman, *The Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches proved to be nearer related to each other than most men imagine*.

Among Catholic divines who have taken the same view, Mr. Fitzpatrick mentions Bossuet, Lingard, C. Butler, Chateaubriand, Lanigan, and Archbishop Murray. He adds that "Clement XIV., one of the most enlightened Popes who ever wore a tiara, heartily desired and personally laboured to effect a union of the Churches." Archbishop Murray avowed his desire for it in his evidence before a Parliamentary Committee, and in a letter to Æneas Macdonnell, to which I shall have occasion to refer again further on, he insists that there are no irreconcilable differences, if only "Church-of-England people were true to the principles laid down in their Prayer-Book," while "on our side, as the instruments of the Most High for preaching peace to men of goodwill, *we should leave nothing undone*, short of sacrificing truth, towards

uniting divided Christendom." The notes of what passed at a meeting of a mixed deputation of Catholics and Protestants, who waited on Bishop Doyle to discuss the question, are exceedingly interesting. The Bishop declared himself "too good a Papist" to compromise any point of faith. How then, it was asked, could a union be effected? He replied that the process might be difficult on account of the passions and interests involved, but in itself was exceedingly simple. "I could frame a bill, not so long as the Declaration of Rights, which, if passed by Parliament, would effect a union, and a union which would be more beneficial to England than even her union with Scotland and Ireland." He added, that "its object would be to heal the schism which separates England from the source and centre of unity, and that once effected, our idolatry and her heresy would shortly disappear." A Protestant asked him if there was no essential difference in matters of doctrine between the Churches? He replied that he thought there was, but that the points of difference were few, and the quarrel turned mainly on matters of discipline and religious forms and usages. There would be no great difficulty in reconciling the Tridentine doctrinal decisions with the Anglican Articles,¹ while, as to the disciplinary canons, "they might or might not be received in England; indeed many of them are perfectly inapplicable to her, and a substitute for

¹ It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that this has been allowed on both sides before and since, as by Sancta Clara, Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Pusey, Bishop Forbes, and others.

others might be found in our Acts of Parliament." A gentleman observed that Mr. (Alexander) Knox had expressed his opinion that on the subject of Transubstantiation there was no difference of belief, but that the vital difference between the Churches regarded the right of private judgment in interpreting Scripture. The Bishop replied, "Mr. Knox is right on the first subject. *Transubstantiation is essentially included in the doctrine of the Real Presence*;¹ *and so is that of the Sacrifice of the Mass.*" The right of private judgment depended on the nature and extent of Church authority, to which it must of necessity be subordinated, as it was in the practice if not in the theory of the Church of England.² It was not Bishop Doyle's fault that he held out his olive-branch before Anglicans were in a condition to accept it. But being dead he yet speaketh, and the bread cast upon the waters has not been thrown away. The first note of the great religious revival, of which Coleridge and Walter Scott had been the effective, however unconscious, pioneers, had sounded from Oxford just a twelvemonth before the good Bishop, prematurely worn out by his incessant toils, was called, at the age of forty-seven, from his throne in the earthly Church to join the intercessions of the just made perfect, where "State policy, pride, and points of honour"

¹ So Cardinal Wiseman says: "The one is in truth equivalent to the other."—*Lectures on the Eucharist*, p. 304.

² For a further report of this very instructive conference see *Life and Times of Bishop Doyle*, vol. i. pp. 336, 337. The author has collected several striking testimonies of Anglican and Protestant divines on the subject of Reunion in his eighth Appendix, in vol. ii.

can no longer break the accordant harmony of will and voice in the music of the everlasting chant.¹

The next plea for Reunion came also from a Catholic prelate, though a man of very different mental and moral type from Bishop Doyle. In 1841, about six months after the publication of Tract xc., and in friendly response to it, appeared Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman's famous *Letter to Lord Shrewsbury*, now unfortunately out of print.² It hardly gained at the time the attention it deserved, and soon afterwards the stream of individual conversions, following that of the great leader of the movement, diverted men's minds on either side for awhile into a somewhat different channel. In 1857, however, appeared what Bishop Doyle's biographer calls "far the ablest work on this great question," from the pen of my dear friend, to whose memory this volume is dedicated, the late Mr. Phillipps de Lisle;³ himself a convert in boyhood from the Anglican to the Roman Communion, he concentrated the life-long devotion of his talents, his energies, and his prayers, on the task of promoting the reunion of the separated Churches in one faith and one fold. In the same year, and mainly through his instrumentality, was founded,

¹ Bishop Doyle died June 15, 1834. Dr. Newman says in the *Apologia*, p. 35: "The following Sunday, July 14th (1833), Mr. Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the University pulpit. It was published under the title of *National Apostasy*. I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833."

² Some extracts from this Letter are given in the Appendix to my *Letter to F. Lockhart*, pp. 105 sqq. It will be referred to again further on.

³ *The Future Unity of Christendom*. A prefatory note states that the work was "submitted to a theological revision of some learned Catholic divines," who approved it.

on the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (Sept. 8), the "Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom," designed "to unite in a bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions," together with all who, "while they lament the divisions among Christians, look forward for their healing mainly to a Corporate Reunion of those three great bodies which claim for themselves the inheritance of the priesthood and the name of Catholic."¹ Starting from very humble beginnings, it now includes many thousands of members, and the course of events since its first formation twenty-one years ago supplies some evidence of an answer to its prayers. The whole question of Reunion has attained a new prominence since then : it has created for itself a literature ; it has forced itself on public notice ; it has won or extorted a respectful recognition from the leading divines and highest authorities of the Established Church. In 1863 appeared the first number of the *Union Review*. When, four years later, a volume of *Essays on Reunion* by members of different Communions, following two successive volumes of Sermons, appeared under the editorship of the General Secretary of the A. P. U. C., Dr. Pusey, "the Nestor of Anglican theology," contributed a lengthened introductory essay. Two years earlier he had published his *Eirenicon*, and had thereby sanctioned, at once by the weight of his vast learning and the unprecedented influence throughout his own Com-

¹ See Appendix B.

munion, which, to cite Dr. Newman's words, he has "received in his lifetime as well as merited," the momentous principle that there is no insuperable doctrinal difference between the Churches of England and of Rome, and thus "put the whole argument on a new footing."

Nor has the voice of authority been silent. In 1857 the late Bishop Forbes of Brechin, who deservedly enjoyed something of the same universal respect in Scotland, without as well as within the pale of the Episcopal Church, which Bishop Jebb had enjoyed in Ireland, brought forward the subject in his primary Charge, and he returned to it in a later Charge in 1863.¹ Four years afterwards his words were re-echoed from the south of England by another eminent prelate, whose many virtues, even more than his theological learning, commanded the respect of men of all parties and all creeds,—the late Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury.² The subject was again introduced into his Charge of

¹ One of his clergy informed me, that among the many thousands who came with unfeigned marks of respect to visit the chamber where his body lay before interment, were the choir of the principal Catholic church in Dundee. Sermons were preached on him the following Sunday from all the Presbyterian pulpits in the town. His work on the Thirty-nine Articles, written avowedly in the interests of Reunion, is frequently referred to in this volume.

² According to the reports in the contemporary newspapers: "After surveying the state of his diocese, . . . his Lordship proceeded to utter aspirations for a restoration of unity to the Churches. Gliding suddenly into Latin, and appearing to quote from some leader of the movement which began twenty years ago, his Lordship brought his aspirations to a close in these words: 'The Bishop of Rome will not yield to us, but we, together with him, will yield to God' (*Non ille nobis cedet, sed nos una cum illo cedemus Deo*). No part of the Bishop's Charge was delivered with such visible emotion, or in a manner so expressive of earnestness as this remarkable sentence."

1864, from which I have given extracts elsewhere.¹ And in the "Profession of Faith" he made on his deathbed, recorded in the appendix to Dr. Liddon's sermon at his funeral, we find these words, "For many years I have looked forward to, and prayed for, the reunion of Christendom."² The late Bishop Gray of Capetown, whom Anglicans looked up to as a second Athanasius, drew attention to the same subject in his Charge of 1865, declaring the divided state of Christendom to be injurious to the cause of our Lord, hindering the life of God in the individual soul and in religious communities, and threatening the overthrow of the faith. He insisted on the duty of daily intercession for the unity of Christendom, and added, in words which are almost a literal repetition of those already cited of Archbishop Murray's: "If the restoration of unity be the condition of the conversion of the world, every sacrifice but that of truth must be made to attain it." The recent Pan-Anglican Conference, whatever may be thought of some of its other pronouncements, which appear occasionally to oscillate between the region of paradox and platitude, has at least done one good thing in directing that henceforth Tuesday in Rogation-week shall be annually observed throughout the whole Anglican Communion as a day of intercession for the reunion of Christendom.³ On the other

¹ Appendix to *Letter to F. Lockhart*, pp. 132 sqq.

² Appendix to *Life in Death*, Sermon by H. P. Liddon, p. 32. As Bishop Jebb was prayed for in the Catholic churches of Limerick, so Bishop Hamilton was prayed for during his last illness in the Dissenting chapels at Salisbury.

³ See *Letter from the Bishops, including Report adopted by the Conference*, pp. 16, 17, recommending "a season of prayer for the unity of Christendom." An address on the subject had been transmitted to the Archbishop of

hand, it is to be noted that, as far back as 1853, Pius IX. sanctioned the establishment of a Society in Rome for the reunion of the divided Churches, with a special view to the Greek and Greco-Russian Churches, which, in 1857, was extended, at the request of Father Tondini, a member of the Barnabite Order, and a friend of the late Mr. de Lisle's, to include other separated bodies, "especially the Anglicans and others of these kingdoms."¹ The Pope further showed his interest in the cause by allowing a work on the subject, from the pen of the learned Greek, Pitzipios, to issue from the Pontifical press, which contained an account of a remarkable conference held at Berlin in 1854, consisting of "members of the two separated Churches, the Greek and the Latin, and of the Protestant bodies," where, after an elaborate examination of the question, "they came to the unanimous conviction that the reunion of Christendom was feasible." The author not unnaturally dwells on the evidence thus afforded, that "the hour has come for the restoration of unity in the Church of Christ, and that *its accomplishment is to be the special work of our own times.*"²

Frequent reference has already been made to Dr. Döllinger's *Lectures on Reunion* (1872), which, however, by no means contain his first contribution to the

Canterbury, who presided over the Conference, in the name of the A. P. U. C., framed by the present President of the Association, Mr. J. D. Chambers, Recorder of Salisbury, who is well known in the literary world by his learned contributions to liturgical science.

¹ The Holy Sacrifice is offered for this intention, together with special prayers, at ten A.M. every Saturday, in the beautifully restored Church of St. Etheldreda (the ancient Chapel of Ely House), Ely Place, Holborn.

² See *Life and Times of Bishop Doyle*, vol. i. pp. 325, 326.

subject. In almost every work he has published since the appearance of *The Church and the Churches* in 1861, it has held a more or less prominent place. The introduction to that volume, which I shall have occasion to quote again presently, closes with a significant saying of the late German Catholic statesman, Von Radowitz: "We plainly perceive that the minds of men are ranging themselves under two banners, upon one of which is inscribed the name of Christ, the Son of God, while beneath the other are united all to whom that Name is a foolishness and a reproach."¹ In his address delivered before the Munich Congress of Catholic professors and scholars, over which he presided, in September 1863, Dr. Döllinger cited and emphasised a declaration of the leading German newspaper: "German unity is the union of the Confessions in Germany." And in his *Lectures on Reunion* he tells us, that it is the general conviction in foreign countries that the initiative in dealing with this world-wide question belongs to Germany, which took the lead in the original disruption. The Reunion Conferences at Bonn, organised under his direction in 1874 and 1875, gave further evidence of his zeal in the cause; but the circumstances under which they assembled precluded the hope of anything beyond a purely tentative and preliminary treatment of existing difficulties. There is considerable evidence, as I have pointed out in former works, of a reaction towards Catholic orthodoxy in modern Lutheran divines; to those who are familiar with German theology, the names of Neumann, Schulze,

¹ *The Church and the Churches*, Eng. Tr., p. 19.

Rothe, Liebner, and Martensen will at once suggest illustrations of this tendency. The author of a work published in 1863, under the title of *Pax Vobiscum*, an influential Protestant clergyman in Franconia, insists that the contest for dear life, which both Catholics and Protestants will have to wage with the giant power of unbelief, can only be fought successfully with their forces united.

And if we turn to our own country, there are not wanting signs outside the Anglican pale of an instinctive craving for the restoration of visible unity. Even the Evangelical Alliance gives abnormal expression to the reality of a need it reveals but cannot satisfy. Far more striking is the testimony offered by another movement, almost contemporaneous in origin with the Tractarian, but emanating from the Presbyterian community, to the principle it unconsciously caricatures. The special charge against Protestantism in the "Great Testimony," presented by the Irvingite Apostles to the Pope and all the crowned heads and leading prelates of Christendom, is its denial of "the essential unity of the Church," to which, it is added, the Roman Catholic Church has alone borne witness, though of course, on their theory, in a perverted form. That strange Communion, with its lofty pretensions and claim to an Œcumenical Apostolate, is really one of the smallest of the hundred and fifty English sects, and since the death last year of Mr. Cardale, "the pillar-apostle," who, by force of character even more than by virtue of his office, had always been its ruling spirit, may be

expected rapidly to decline. But as an ecclesiastical phenomenon, unique in its way, and bringing homage from an unexpected quarter to many central Catholic verities, it must always hold its place in the history of religious thought.¹ There are, moreover, increasing indications of gradual dismemberment or collapse perceptible among the oldest and most influential Protestant Nonconformist bodies in this country;² while the famous disruption of the Scottish Establishment in 1843 has made a breach in the Presbyterian system from which it has never recovered, and which is confessedly pregnant with further results conducive to the strengthening of the Catholic and Episcopal Churches in that country. In many churches of the Establishment there is a studied approximation already to the Anglican ritual, which would have incurred the severest anathemas of the

¹ The best account I know of this eccentric but instructive phase of religionism will be found in the Rev. E. Miller's *History and Doctrines of Irvingism*, which is written in a candid and temperate spirit, and based on a careful examination of facts. There are only two of the original twelve Apostles surviving, both of whom have long since retired from all active discharge of the duties of their office, and no attempt has been made to fill up the vacancies. The number of Irvingites in Great Britain and the Colonies cannot, at the outside, be reckoned at above 7000, of whom 3000 are in London. There are said to be some 3000 more scattered over the Continent. Cf. also *Saturday Review* for July 28, 1877, "The Irvingite Apostolate," and review of Miller's book in *Saturday Review* for January 29, 1878.

² *Whitaker's Almanack* for 1878 gives five principal secessions from the original Wesleyan community, viz., the Methodist New Connection, formed in 1797; the Primitive Methodists, in 1810; the Bible Christians, in 1815; the United Methodist Free Churches, consolidated out of three previous secessions, in 1828; the Wesleyan Reform Union, comprising those seceders of 1849 who refused to amalgamate with the last-named community. Several Wesleyan ministers have sought ordination from the present Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Wordsworth.

authors and original adherents of the Solemn League and Covenant.¹ In the United States both the Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches have been steadily gaining ground during the last century—the former of course partly through the Irish immigration ; but the Wesleyans at present stand first, and the Baptists second, in numerical order ; the Congregationalists, who at the commencement of that period headed the list, having sunk to the seventh place.²

And if we take a wider sweep, and look back only over the last twenty years, since the foundation of the Association already mentioned for Promoting the Unity of Christendom, it is impossible not to be struck with the great changes that have occurred in the condition of all the “ three great bodies ” which divide between them the immense majority of professing Christians. The largest and most powerful of them all has been shaken, first by the discussion and then by the collapse of the temporal power of the Papacy, which had lasted for a thousand years, while its internal and external condition has been importantly and variously modified

¹ Some years ago I myself witnessed a service in the old parish church of Dundee, restored by the late Sir G. Scott, differing very little, except in the absence of a surplice, from the Evangelical presentation of Anglican worship. There was an organ ; psalms or canticles (from the Bible version of course) were sung ; two lessons were read ; a hymn-book authorised by the General Assembly, and containing, *inter alia*, several of Faber's hymns, was used ; and the prayers, whether printed or not, were evidently *not* extempore. In the parish church of St. Andrews, which contains “ the Martyrdom ” of Archbishop Sharp, the clerk informed us that Dr. Boyd (“ A. K. H. B. ”) was going to restore the chancel, and place a “ communion-table ” on the site of the former altar. Such details may be insignificant *per se*, but they are straws to mark the direction of the stream.

² See an interesting paper in the centenary number of the *North American Review*, April 1876.

by the action of the longest, and in some respects perhaps most eventful, pontificate on record, the net result of which we are hardly as yet in a position to appreciate. Meanwhile, not to dwell here on the increasing signs of a re-awakened interest in the Reunion question which have been manifested in many quarters, and the greater freedom and friendliness of personal intercourse between those who are ecclesiastically separated, the Catholic or Ultramontane reaction—whichever we please to term it—originating, like the Tractarian movement in England, in a recoil from what may be loosely designated the principles of the French Revolution, has culminated in the Vatican Council; and there seems reason to hope that henceforth, under the rule of the wise and excellent Pontiff who now occupies the chair of Peter, more temperate and conciliatory counsels are likely to prevail in influential quarters. In the Church of England a double movement has been in progress—on the one hand, in the Broad Church or sceptical direction; on the other, in the direction of what has come to be known by the clumsy and deceptive misnomer of “Ritualism:” and the growing strife between these rival influences from within conspires with the organised hostility of Nonconformist assailants from without to prepare the way for disestablishment. On the merits of that many-sided and difficult question I desire to pronounce no opinion here. But whatever might be its immediate advantages or disadvantages, whether in the religious or political sphere—and it is hard to form even a probable forecast of the operation

of disestablishment in either,—there can be no doubt that it would remove one serious hindrance to a future reunion. If we turn to the Oriental Churches, even there signs are manifest of a change in the unchangeable. The approaching or actual liberation of many millions of Eastern Christians from the debasing and unnatural thralldom of centuries under a barbarian and infidel despotism, and the closer relations into which both they and their Russian brethren are likely to be drawn with Western Christendom, must count for something in any estimate of the religious possibilities of the future.

But beyond and apart from the action of all special tendencies or parties in this or that Communion, yet helping to interpret and interpenetrate all of them, one great fact confronts us, whichever way we look : it is the steady, resolute, defiant advance of the infidel, or rather atheist, propaganda throughout Europe. This is the ultimate solution of the questionings of the sixteenth century, as it has been epigrammatically observed that “the French Revolution was the second act of the Reformation.” Protestantism, as a dogmatic and religious system, has had its day ; three centuries have sufficed to elicit and exhaust its inherent capabilities in that line ; it has been weighed in the balance of history and found wanting. I say, Protestantism as a religious system, for of course I am aware that it is still powerful as a political rallying-cry ; but that is a strength not specifically religious, still less specifically Christian. This decline is not matter of speculation, but of fact ; and

while from a controversial point of view the fact might be gratifying, its moral and religious significance is of very grave import indeed. "Men die," it has been said by a writer who was once a clergyman, "of many diseases; creeds of only one, that of being found out." Yet this writer is far too acute not to be well aware that a religion without a creed has no better principle of vitality than a flower without a root. He had previously written that "unsectarian Christianity can no more exist than a triangle which is neither scalene, isosceles, nor equilateral . . . to proclaim it is to proclaim that Christianity is dead . . . it consists in shirking the difficulty and trying hard to believe that the passion will survive without its essential basis." And Protestantism tends every day more and more, by the law of its being, to become "unsectarian," that is, creedless, while—to cite another popular writer of the day—"Catholicism is the one form of supernatural religion that survives unshattered." In England the creedless and godless system of Board School education—itself a direct outgrowth of our state of religious division—is gradually but surely superseding all "denominational" agencies, by means of a huge and scandalous waste of public money; and, if it be not promptly and vigorously counteracted, will sap in the minds of the rising generation the very foundations of all moral and religious belief.

The crisis the world is passing through now cuts much deeper than the Reformation, though it makes less noise. The Reformers questioned the authority

of the infallible Church, but they professed to substitute for it the authority of an infallible book. "The Bible, and the Bible only," as Chillingworth put it, was to be the "religion of Protestants." But the Reformers forgot two things which the inexorable logic of experience has forced on the attention of their children. In the first place, the Bible, if it is to be a practical guide, needs an interpreter: *Scriptura est sensus Scripturæ*. And in the absence of an interpreter who can speak with authority, scriptural truth is reduced to what every man troweth: *quot homines, tot sententiæ*. In the next place, the same critical process, which had been applied as a solvent to the authority of the Church, could be applied—as it has, in fact, since been applied—with yet more fatal facility to undermine the authority of a Bible left to stand alone. The result was foreshadowed in the old distich, though it has taken three centuries to work it out in detail:

"Tota jacet Babylon, destruxit tecta Lutherus,
Calvinus muros, et fundamenta Socinus."

Calvin designated the Nicene Creed *frigida cantilena*, and sneered at the formula "God from God, Light from Light" as a Platonising dream. Socinus was the father of modern rationalism. He openly denied the fundamental tenet only of the Christian Revelation, and on a professedly scriptural plea. But that denial carried with it the entire faith, and moreover he did not venture to show his hand freely, and rejected more than he openly avowed. It is not therefore wonderful that belief in the Divinity of our

Blessed Lord should have almost wholly disappeared in our own day from among the Protestants of Germany, Switzerland, and France, the spiritual descendants of Luther and Calvin; much the same may be said of Denmark and Holland, and of several large Protestant bodies in North America. Experience seems pretty clearly to prove that faith in the Trinity and Incarnation is never secure where (1) the Athanasian Creed is rejected, and (2) the hierarchy is abolished. In a famous trial in 1832 it came out that the main body of English Presbyterians had become Socinians.

It has been left for the present generation to witness the final outcome of the Reformation teaching. The Iconoclasts of the sixteenth century put the Bible in place of the Church; the Iconoclasts of our own day are as little tolerant of one form of image-worship as of another. If indeed, as a modern writer phrases it, "*la souplesse de Protestantisme*" will allow them "to drop out of the Bible quietly" such doctrines as they dislike, they are willing to do justice to its varied and not inconsiderable historical and literary interest; they will even take the trouble to construct for us a new method of Scriptural exegesis, omitting the "magical story" of the Incarnation, and the baseless hypothesis of "a personal God." But if its authority is invoked for doctrines which their "verifying faculty" rejects—say, *e.g.* for the doctrine of eternal punishment, which it teaches with unpleasant emphasis and iteration—it must be clearly understood that no such authority can be allowed to a book any more than to a

priesthood. Christianity is true, only because it is "as old as the Creation;" it is true, in other words, as an echo of enlightened reason, not as a voice from heaven.

Let me illustrate this view of the gravity of the situation from the words of a thoughtful and powerful, who is also a religious-minded, writer of the day. "The Reformation," he remarks, "was a tremendous earthquake; it shook down the fabric of mediæval religion, and as a consequence of the disturbance in the religious sphere, filled the world with revolutions and wars. *But it left the authority of the Bible unshaken*, and men might feel that the destructive process had its limit, and that adamant was still under their feet. But a world which is intellectual and keenly alive to the significance of these questions, reading all that is written about them with almost passionate avidity, finds itself brought to a crisis, the character of which any one may realise by distinctly presenting to himself *the idea of existence without a God.*"¹ How fares it with Germany, the birthplace and natural home of Protestantism? I well remember my amazement some twenty years ago, when I knew much less of the state of things there than I do now, at the revelations of a young German with whom I

¹ Goldwin Smith, in *Macmillan's Magazine* for Feb. 1878, p. 265. Cf. the remarkable testimony of the same writer in an earlier work: "The reunion of Christendom is likely at last to become a practical aim. Probably it would be a greater service to humanity, on philosophical as well as religious grounds, to contribute the smallest mite towards this consummation, than to construct the most perfect demonstration of the free personality of man." . . . "As things are, rationalism and fatalistic reveries may be laboriously confuted, but amidst the energies and aspirations of a regenerated Christendom they would spontaneously pass away."—G. Smith's *Lectures on the Study of History*, 2d edition, p. 181.

was conversing about the religious condition of his country. He had told me that his brother was a "minister," and at last I asked whether his brother shared the opinions he had been describing. The answer promptly returned, with imperturbable gravity and without any touch of humour, was, "Oh no; my brother is what you in England call a High Churchman; for example, he *believes in God*." There would perhaps be nothing very startling, even to English ears, in the answer now. But in those days we had not been taught by our guides and philosophers to resolve our Creator into an "Unknown and Unknowable," or "a stream of tendency." Nor had a religion been publicly proclaimed—with hierarchy, ritual, and sacraments—which makes a denial of God the first article of its creed. In Berlin, at the present day, with a population of over a million, the average attendance at public worship on Sundays is reported to be about thirty thousand. And Berlin is in this respect a microcosm of Protestant Germany. The author of a recent work, *German Home Life*, says that men never think of attending church, as a rule, after they are confirmed, that is, after they become their own masters. And what is the explanation of this? The unhappy boy who, not many years ago, fired at the officiating minister in a church at Berlin, while repeating the Apostles' Creed, suggested it, when he defended his act on the score that the man was a hypocrite for professing what he knew he did not believe. It was only indeed by the personal interposition of the Emperor, overruling the decision

of the Consistories, that the Apostles' Creed escaped being struck out of the Evangelical liturgy last year.¹ And the enforced fusion more than half a century ago (in 1817), by the absolute fiat of Frederick William III. of Prussia, of the Lutheran and Calvinist bodies—fundamentally opposed to each other on some of the most vital doctrines of the Gospel—was at once a sign and an instrument of the decadence of all definite belief. The atheistic temper of the present Socialist movement in Germany is too notorious to require being dwelt upon.

And that atheistic temper is by no means confined to Germany. It may be less outspoken in England, but it is far more outspoken than it was some twenty years ago. It is politely whispered in the drawing-room; it is openly avowed or implied in almost every leading magazine. And it naturally allies itself with that classical Renaissance—the bastard reproduction of the Renaissance of the fifteenth century—which is infecting our cultivated literature and our social life, and threatens to revive at once the licence and the cruelty of the darkest age of Paganism.² It is true indeed that there lies in the depths of human nature, as Ozanam justly remarked, “an imperishable instinct of Paganism,” which from time to time crops out afresh on the surface. But there has been a very

¹ A studiously vague assertion of the supernatural element in religion, omitting all reference to the Divinity of Christ, was only carried with difficulty by a majority of sixty-one to forty-six in the Synod of the French Protestant Church in June 1872, under the influence of Guizot.

² It is a significant fact from this point of view that Professor Huxley and Professor Tyndall are among the most pronounced and most ruthless advocates of the modern horrors of Vivisection.

special revival of it in our own day, involving, as Mr. St. George Mivart has pointed out, "a dislike and rejection of the supernatural, its aspirations, its consolations, and its terrors;" recalling indeed but too faithfully that hatred of the "pale Galilean," which inspired the policy of the apostate Emperor of old, and hung in a muttered curse on his dying lips:

"Though all men abase them before you in spirit, and all knees bend,

I kneel not, neither adore you, but standing look to the end."

The rival powers of Christianity and Paganism stood face to face in one historic scene, when Savonarola lifted the crucifix before the dying eyes of Lorenzo di Medici, and was bidden to go his way. They are confronted now in the experience of many lives—it may be in the agony of many impenitent deathbeds—throughout civilised Europe.

If it be asked what all this has to do with the question of Reunion, the reply is not far to seek. The advancing pressure of the infidel movement supplies at once the clinching justification of the enterprise, and the surest augury of ultimate success. That movement can only be effectually met by Christendom presenting a united front to the onset of a common foe. And the conviction that this is so makes itself growingly felt among all who, amid whatever differences in detail, still hold, or desire to hold, to Christianity, in the historical, which—in spite of *Literature and Dogma*—is the only real and intelligible, sense of the word. Let me instance the striking confession of a recent writer in *Fraser's Magazine*, who has been

sketching successively "the Past and Future of the Evangelical, the High Church, and the Broad Church Party in the Church of England," and whose personal sympathies, so far as they are indicated, appear to be chiefly with the last. He is far from attempting to disguise or to minimise the fundamental differences which separate "Ritualists" from "Evangelicals," yet he detects a common principle underlying them all, and inevitably destined to assert itself under pressure of external assaults. "The Christendom of the future," he says, "will according to all appearances be merged in (it may be) its final divisions, the party of Authority, and that of Free Inquiry and Criticism. And if so, it is certain that in the former party will be found the High Church, the Low Church, and the Roman Catholics, merging their differences in the preparation for the final struggle."¹ Is it not indeed pitiful to see religious men splitting hairs over the truth of the Real Presence, or Purgatory, or the Invocation of Saints, which are just as much part and parcel of historical Christianity as the Incarnation or the Atonement, though the evidence may not lie as conspicuously on the surface, when their real contest, if they knew it, lies with the enemies not simply of Revelation but of theism.²

On the Continent this is already pretty clearly understood. Such a work, *e.g.* as Möhler's *Symbolik*, first

¹ "R. E. B." in *Fraser's Magazine*, February 1878.

² In his address at the opening of the Pan-Anglican Conference, July 2, 1878, Archbishop Tait is reported to have said, "When every common periodical is filled with questionings *whether there be a personal God, whether there be a life hereafter, whether a Revelation is possible*, the Church has something else to do than to confine herself to these (minor) details."—*Times* of July 3, 1878.

published in 1832, could hardly be written in Germany in the present day; not, of course, that it can ever lose its permanent value as one of the soundest and most luminous expositions of Catholic doctrine on all the leading points brought into controversy at the Reformation. But, as an *argumentum ad hominem*, it has lost its force for those to whom it was originally addressed, and who would now meet the most conclusive refutations of solifidian or predestinarian error with the previous question—Whether there is any future life, or any God at all? What avails it to discuss the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist with those who laugh to scorn the idea of His Divinity, and doubt, if they do not deny, the existence of Deity altogether? Strauss put the question plainly in his latest work, “Are we Christians?”—and answered it—quite correctly, as regards those for whom he spoke—with an emphatic “No.” The old watchwords of Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy are relegated to the domain of history, when theism is, at best, on its trial, and Christianity is definitely condemned. To cite the words of a late eminent French statesman and Protestant: “It is in fact the whole Church of Christ, and not this or that Church in particular, which in the present day is the object of attack in its fundamental principles. When the supernatural world, the inspiration of the Sacred Books, and the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ are denied, the blow falls upon the shoulders of the whole body of Christians, whether Catholics, Protestants, or Greeks, and all Christians, whatever their private grounds of disagreement from

each other, or their forms of Church-government, are robbed of the very basis of their faith." ¹

In this country the civil war between professing, and often sincerely professing, Christians is still prolonged, and therefore it is important to show how little plausible reason there is for doubts and wranglings, from which nothing can be gained except for the cause of unbelief. Works like Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon* or Möhler's *Symbolik*, from whichever side they emanate, are valuable for this end. They must serve to convince all who are really in earnest that those who are resolved to adhere to historical Christianity have no choice but to throw in their lot with Catholicism. All positive teaching, whether Roman, Greek, or Anglican—nay, even the positive teaching of the Protestant sects, when it is scrutinised—points in the same direction; it is only negations that require to be unlearned. And herein lies the special interest and importance of the work republished in this volume. The anonymous author, who writes under a manifest sense of grave responsibility, and with a keen appreciation of the fatal consequences of disunion, reviews one by one all the points objected by Anglicans to the doctrine or practice of the Church of Rome, and undertakes to show in each case, with the aid of copious testimonies, Anglican and Roman, either that the doctrine of the two Communions rightly inter-

¹ Preface to Guizot's *Meditations on the Christian Religion*. A prophet of "Neochristianity" in the *Fortnightly Review* pleasantly announces his expectation that "the various orthodox sects, with their chronic civil war, will continue in a state of heedlessness not wholly unlike that which the Gospel attributes to the antediluvian world; they will preach, they will write, they will cavil, they will give in to cavils, till science comes and destroys them all." —*F. R.*, December 1877, p. 844.

preted is identical, or at least that there is no such difference as to give Anglicans legitimate ground for separation. The work curiously anticipates in its general tone, and in many points of detail, the line of argument of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*; and this is the more remarkable when the date of its composition is borne in mind, and the fact, already noticed, that the author to all appearance, and indeed avowedly, was what would now be called a man of moderate opinions. He applies throughout, though he never quotes it, the principle of the Vincentian rule—*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—which was the watchword of the Tractarian movement in our own day. And an excellent principle it is, as far as it goes; only in a world like this it requires for practical use to be supplemented by another great principle, which is as old at least as the time of St. Augustine—*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*. To proclaim that principle in the fourth century was to appeal, not to a theological formula, but to a visible fact, which could not be gainsaid. It was the direct tendency of the Reformation movement, *valeat quantum*, to destroy the force of that appeal. For the separated bodies it became impossible in their separation, for they are compelled either to argue that the *orbis terrarum* has ceased to exist, or to admit that its witness is against them; "this anarchy," as Dupanloup puts it, "is the source of our weakness, and the most active solvent of all religious faith." The patent and irrefragable cogency of that same appeal it is the object of Reunionists to restore. On the manifold evils of division, which I have elsewhere taken occasion

to dwell upon, it is needless to enlarge further here. One thing at least is certain. As long as the divisions of Christendom offer a plausible pretext for the perversity of misbelievers, the arrogance of sceptics, the perplexity of the heathen, we shall still be confronted, in this nineteenth century since our Lord was crucified, with the standing scandal of a rampant atheism, a heathen proletariat, a half-paralysed Christianity, and an unconverted world. Yet society shrugs its shoulders, and murmurs, with the self-complacent *insouciance* of a Gallio, that the reunion of Christendom is an "unpractical" idea, the day-dream of idle enthusiasts.

And now to note briefly a few of the salient points in the following Essay. The author begins by laying down certain rules important to be observed in religious discussion. Of these, with the exception of the first rule, on distinguishing matters of faith from matters of opinion—the supreme necessity of which is self-evident, though it is too often ignored in practice—the third, on the duty of explaining terms, with the fourth, which is its natural sequel, is far the most essential to be kept habitually in mind. It has been acutely observed that half the disputes in the world arise from using terms in different senses, and therefore, as Dr. Newman has somewhere said, most of our controversies would be shown at once by *defining terms* to be either superfluous or fruitless. To apply this critical principle to the difference between Roman and Anglican doctrine, let me cite the following remarkable passage from the Introduction to Döllinger's *Kirche und Kirchen*, published in 1861: "Upon the

day when, on both sides, the conviction shall arise, vivid and strong, that Christ really desires the unity of His Church, that the divisions of Christendom, the multiplicity of Churches, is displeasing to God—that *he who helps to prolong this situation must answer for it to the Lord*—on that day four-fifths of the traditional polemics of Protestants against the Catholic Church will be cast aside, like chaff and rubbish, with one blow; for *four-fifths of it consist of misunderstandings, logomachies, and wilful falsifications, or relate to personal and therefore accidental things, which are utterly insignificant where only principles and dogmas are at stake.* On that day, also, much will be changed on the Catholic side.”¹ So again, in the Letter already so often referred to, Bishop Doyle says: “On most of these [chief points in dispute] it seems to me that there is no essential difference between the Catholics and Protestants; the existing diversity of opinion arises in most cases from certain *forms of words* which admit of satisfactory explanation, or from the *ignorance or misconceptions* which ancient prejudice and ill-will produce or strengthen, but which could be removed.” Cardinal Wiseman insists on the same view in his *Letter to Lord Shrewsbury*, where he says: “*We must explain to the utmost*” (p. 31); and again, “I have thus stated what would seem to be our first duty; to offer cheerfully and honestly *every explanation in our power*, and point out where our real doctrines are mistaken, where they are confounded with mere permissive practices, and where they may be liable to abuse.

¹ *The Church and the Churches*, p. 18.

. . . There exist at this moment, I am sure, grievous misapprehensions in the minds of serious men connected with the new [Oxford] movement upon this point, which more direct and friendly intercourse could remove" (p. 33). And he proceeds to speak of Tract xc. having supplied "the demonstration that such interpretation may be given of the most difficult [of the Thirty-nine] Articles as will strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine Syond" (p. 38). The late Archbishop Murray of Dublin, in a letter to Mr. Æneas Macdonnell, already mentioned, the original of which has been shown to me by its present owner, says that "were Church-of-England people true to the principles laid down in their Prayer-Book, the doctrinal differences, *which appear considerable, but are not*, would soon be removed." It would be easy to multiply testimonies to the importance of the fundamental principle thus laid down by our author and illustrated throughout his work. But two or three examples of its application may be more to the purpose here.

Take for instance the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, which, according to the late Bishop Forbes, has practically widened the breach more than anything else.¹ We are not concerned, of course, as our author points out, with abuses, whether of practice or belief, but only with the authorised teaching and usage of the Church. Why then should it be thought unscriptural to ask the prayers of Saints departed, when it is certainly scriptural to ask the prayers of our living friends? And if the fervent prayer of the just avails on

¹ *Explanation of Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii. p. 377.

earth, what sane man will venture (as Bishop William Forbes remarks¹) to slight the intercession of the just made perfect, whose spiritual gaze is purged from earthly film, whose wills are in perfect harmony with the will of the All-holy and All-wise, whose snow-white robes are blanched with the brightness of the Un-created Sunlight? And how can it be unreasonable to seek their intercession, when it is most reasonable to believe that they intercede? How indeed can we realise "the Communion of Saints" without doing so? But we are reminded that it trenches on the exclusive homage which "a jealous God" refuses to share with even the most exalted of His creatures. This is simply a misconception based on a confusion of thought. The great Anglican poet of our age has told us that Mary's name "*all but adoring* love may claim." More than this no Catholic would dare to claim for her, with less no Christian should be content. To adore is to offer that supreme homage, technically called *latria*, which finds its full and final expression in the act of sacrifice, and to offer this to any created being is idolatry. Sacrifice from the beginning of the world has represented the absolute and inalienable devotion owed by the creature to the Creator, divinely foreshadowed in the manifold typical oblations of the Patriarchal and Mosaic ritual, divinely commemorated, once for all, in the great Oblation of Calvary, divinely perpetuated, not in shadow but in substance, till the Redeemer comes once more, in the daily Sacrifice of the Mass. In that sacrificial homage the highest of creatures is

¹ *Consid. Modest.*, De Purg. cap. 3, p. 307.

levelled with the least ; all must alike unite in offering, none may claim any part in receiving it. Mary knelt in common adoration with the humblest of her fellow-Christians before the altar, as she had watched with the virgin-apostle, the pardoned Magdalene, the penitent thief, the awe-struck centurion, the careless multitude, beneath the darkened Cross. It is natural that those who have failed to grasp the sacrificial idea of worship should misapprehend the invocation of Saints. Compared to that supreme adoration of the Most High, it has been justly said, all lesser acts of devotion "are but friendly familiarities." To cite but a few leading witnesses, Protestant and Anglican :—Grotius argues at length that it is no disparagement of the honour due to God alone, or of the Mediatorial office of our sole Redeemer, nay, that it cannot but be pleasing to Him, to call on the Saints—our fellow-pilgrims here, fellow-servants still and fellow-citizens with us of the heavenly Jerusalem—to join their prayers with ours, in accordance with the ancient and universal practice of the best ages of the Church.¹ Bishop Montague, whose testimony is quoted by our author, can see no impiety or dishonour to Christ in saying, "Holy Mary, pray for me."² Bishop Forbes considers the invoca-

¹ Grotius, *Consult. Cassandri*, ad Art. xx., De Cultu Sanct.

² The testimony of Montague derives additional weight from his subsequent elevation to the Episcopate, and from the circumstance that one of his principal works, which is frequently cited by our author, the *Just Appeal*, published in 1625 under high royal and ecclesiastical sanction, had been made the subject of an indictment by the House of Commons, whereupon "Laud and some other Bishops applied to the Duke of Buckingham in his favour, and not in his favour chiefly, but in favour of the *Church of England*, whose cause they represented to be the same with his." The King

tion or "interpellation" of the Saints "lawful, pious, and useful," and holds it "most perilous to despise or condemn the universal consent of the whole Church, in East and West alike, for ages past, in asking their prayers in her litanies."¹ And he cites to this effect the testimony, among others, of Casaubon, Gerhard, Œcolampadius, and Bucer. Bishop Ken did not scruple directly to invoke his Guardian Angel in a hymn which has long since virtually passed into a supplement of the Anglican Prayer-Book. In our own day, the late Bishop Forbes of Brechin has offered substantially the same explanation and defence of the practice as his earlier namesake of Edinburgh.²

Thus again, as regards the relation of Scripture and Tradition noticed below in chapters xii. and xiii., Dr. Newman has pointed out that the difference between Roman and Anglican teaching is "merely one of words." It is allowed on both sides that there is a twofold rule, Scripture and Tradition, and when Anglicans affirm and Catholics deny that every doctrine can be "proved" from Scripture, they attach a different sense to the

therefore, at the request of the House, referred the matter to a Committee of four Bishops, including Laud, Andrewes, and Buckeridge (" *Roffensis noster*," as our author calls him), who reported "that Mr. Montague in his book hath not affirmed anything to be the doctrine of the Church of England but that which, in our opinion, is the doctrine of the Church of England, or agreeable thereto." Among the points censured in Montague's book, on which this judgment was pronounced, are his apology for Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, seven Sacraments, Invocation of Saints, and Confession.—See MacColl's *Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism, and Ritualism*, pp. 314 *sqq.*

¹ See his *Consid. Modest.*, De Invoc. Sanct., cap. 3, 4 (pp. 306, 322, ed. 1658).

² *Explanation of Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii. pp. 377 *sqq.* On the whole subject of devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, see Dr. Newman's *Letter to Dr. Pusey on his Eirenicon*.

word "proof;"—"We mean that not every article of faith is so contained there that it may thence be logically proved, *independently* of the teaching and authority of the Tradition; but Anglicans mean that every article of faith is so contained there that it may thence be proved, *provided* there be added the illustrations and compensations supplied by the Tradition. And it is in this latter sense that the Fathers also speak. . . . Thus *you* do not deny that the whole is not in Scripture in such sense that pure unaided logic can draw it from the sacred text; nor do *we* deny that the faith is in Scripture, in an improper sense, in the sense that *Tradition* is able to recognise and determine it there."¹ Cardinal Wiseman similarly insists that "the Catholic has no need of any other groundwork of his faith beyond the written Word of God."² And Dollinger gives the same testimony, that, according to the Fathers, "there is no point of Christian doctrine which is not attested and laid down in the Apostolic writings."³ Bishop Forbes sums up the discussion in a few words, when he says that "Holy Scripture, either *implicité* or *explicité*, contains the faith."⁴

Or let us turn to an objection which has perhaps caused more bitterness of feeling, and is more persistently repeated, than any other, though it is based on an ignorant or perverse misapprehension, which has again and again been explained; I mean what our

¹ *Letter to Dr. Pusey on Eirenicon*, p. 14.

² *Lectures on Catholic Church*, vol. i. p. 60.

³ *First Age of the Church*, vol. i. p. 255, 3d ed. See the whole chapter on "Scripture and Tradition."

⁴ *Explanation of Articles*, vol. i. p. 95.

author speaks of (in chapter xii.) as the alleged "un-charitableness of the Church of Rome," in other words, the doctrine of exclusive salvation. Thus only two years ago a Protestant controversialist in the *Contemporary Review*, who had no excuse for not knowing better, went out of his way, in discussing quite another subject, to assert that, according to Catholic doctrine, "the fixed abode of sin and misery remains for all who are *extra Ecclesiam*,"—meaning, as the context necessarily implies, all who are without the visible Church. And he even proceeded to make polemical capital out of his own gratuitous blunder, by kindly insinuating that "so far as the belief in their hopeless destiny is realised and assented to, it can hardly fail to cause estrangement, intolerance, perhaps indifference to their sufferings here, when they are viewed as reserved for endless suffering hereafter."¹ A more recent, and far more sensible and temperate writer in the same magazine, quotes, in this sense, the condemned proposition of the Syllabus, that "we may entertain at least a good hope of the eternal salvation of *all* those who are *in no manner* in the true Church of Christ."² Now I am not at all bound here, for the purpose of my argument, to defend the language of the Syllabus. It is a moot point among the most decided infallibilists, whether it is an *ex cathedrâ* document or not, and the greatest living Catholic divine, Dr. Newman, dismisses

¹ Professor Mayor, in *Contemporary Review* for May 1876.

² Principal Reynolds, in *Contemporary Review* for July 1878. The Latin text of the Syllabus is, "Saltem bene sperandum est de æternâ illorum *omnium* salute, qui in verâ Christi Ecclesiâ *nequaquam* versantur."

the idea with something like contempt.¹ However, the proposition cited is, on any intelligible Christian hypothesis, so obviously true as barely to escape being a truism; and it is very happily framed, so as at least to suggest to any intelligent reader the real meaning of the principle, so absurdly misconstrued and so bitterly assailed by writers like Mr. May, which is that not of the Church of Rome only, but of every Christian Communion, and is expressly affirmed under anathema in the eighteenth Article of the Church of England.² The proposition condemned in the Syllabus would, in the first place, practically involve the heresy of Universalism, for if "all who are in no sense in the true Church" are to be saved, it is hardly conceivable that any who are in it should be lost. But, waiving this point, to deny the salvation of those who in no sense are members (*nequaquam versantur*) of the true Church of Christ, points at once to

¹ *Letter to Duke of Norfolk*, p. 79.

² An Anglican friend reminds me that this same principle is laid down in the most express terms in so well known and standard a classic as the Rev. Sir W. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, which is, or was within my memory, on the examination list of English Bishops for their ordination candidates. In vol. i. ch. i. sect. 3, the author thus defines the principle, in precise accord with the teaching of Catholic theology: "I maintain that salvation is only offered in the Church of Christ by divine revelation, and that all men to whom the Gospel is preached must be members of this Church, *when sufficiently proposed to them*, on pain of being excluded from the favour of God for ever." He adds that "these are indeed the sentiments of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church." Then he goes on to show that all Protestant Communions maintain this principle as stringently as the Church of Rome, and quotes the following Question and Answer from Nowell's Catechism, which was approved by authority under Queen Elizabeth: "Q. Is there no hope of salvation out of the Church? A. Without it there can be nothing but *damnation, destruction, and perdition*." The italics are his own.

the distinction, familiar not only to every theologian, but to every decently instructed Catholic—and quite familiar also to Anglicans, who are accustomed to speak (like Leslie in the passage cited by our author) of “the uncovenanted mercies of God”—between the body and the soul of the Church. There is the less excuse for misinterpreting the language of the proposition in the Syllabus, because it is expressly based on two previous Encyclicals of Pius IX., which are referred to, and which must of course possess as high an authority, or rather a higher authority, than what Dr. Newman describes as an unofficial collection of propositions gathered out of various Allocutions and Encyclicals by some unknown hand. But if we turn to the two Encyclicals from which this proposition has been derived, we find its meaning unmistakably explained, in the sense already specified, in the context of both of them. In the first (December 9, 1854) the Pope asks, “Who would presume to think himself competent to define the limits of this invincible ignorance, considering the variety of peoples, countries, minds, and other matters to be made allowance for?” In the second (August 10, 1863) he lays down, as a recognised and familiar axiom, which distinctly includes the case not only of ‘involuntary’ heresy, but of heathenism, “*We and you know* that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most holy religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts, which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life,

are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain life eternal.”¹

It may be as well, perhaps, considering the depth of ignorant or wilful misapprehension which prevails on the subject, to add to this sufficiently weighty testimony that of two very eminent Jesuit theologians, De Lugo and Suarez. The importance of clearing up so widely spread and fatal a mistake must excuse the length of my extracts. De Lugo says that “those who do not believe with the Catholic Church may be divided into many classes. Some do not believe all Catholic doctrines, yet acknowledge One True and Living God, as Turks, Mahometans, and Jews. Others acknowledge also Christ and the Trinity, as do many heretics. Those who are invincibly ignorant concerning some articles of faith and believe others are *not formal heretics, but have supernatural faith*, whereby they believe some truths, and can proceed from these to acts of perfect contrition, and thus attain to justification and salvation. The same may be said of such Jews as are invincibly ignorant of the Christian faith. . . . So also there is no reason why Mahometans, invincibly ignorant of Christ and His Divinity, should not believe with supernatural faith in God. . . . So too of such of the ancient philosophers as believed in the true God.” He goes on to say that *explicit* faith is not, according to the common view, which is also that of St. Thomas, necessary *necessitate medii*. And to the objection that, if so, Jews and Heathen might be saved through supernatural faith in

¹ See the passages quoted in *Letter to Duke of Norfolk*, pp. 122, 123.

One God, while invincibly ignorant of Christ, and therefore no Christians, he replied that such a case is quite conceivable, but that "the man *must not be called 'no Christian,'* for, although not visibly received into the Church, yet formally and inwardly he has one faith with the Church, habitual and actual, and in God's sight will be reckoned among Christians."¹ Suarez equally maintains that "of itself, and by virtue of the Divine law and institution, actual explicit faith in Christ is not necessary for final salvation or glory any more than for initial salvation or grace. As to *extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, no one can be saved who does not enter the Church of Christ, either in fact or in solemn purpose and desire. This is certain, for no one is within the Church but the baptized: yet others may be saved, for the solemn purpose of baptism suffices, as does that of entering the Church. Hence we may say the same of any one whatever who believes and is truly penitent, but is not baptized, whether he has attained to explicit or only to implicit faith in Christ, for by that faith he may have the solemn purpose, at least implicit, which suffices as regards baptism, as St. Thomas teaches."² Hence the Church has always recognised not only the baptism of water, but of blood (as regards the martyrs) and of desire; and the desire for baptism is implied (as regards those who are inculpably ignorant of the Christian Revelation) in the desire to do the will of God.

There is another point which may be thought to

¹ De Lugo, *De Fide*, xii. 3.

² Suarez, *De Fide*, xii. 4.

require some notice here. In discussing the question of Papal Infallibility, at the beginning of the second chapter, our author treats it as a private opinion of Bellarmine's, and argues negatively, from the absence of any authoritative statement, and positively, from the adverse testimony of twelve Catholic Universities and fifty-seven theologians of different countries in Europe, to which many later testimonies might be added, that it is evidently no doctrine of the Roman Church. To which it may be replied that this line of argument is superseded by the Vatican decrees, and that therefore—as some have added—all hope of reunion is at an end. The question of the Vatican Council in its various aspects, about which volumes have already been written, is obviously far too wide a one to be parenthetically examined here. All that can be attempted, within our present limits, is to offer a few suggestions in arrest of any such premature and peremptory judgment. In the first place, then, the facts mentioned by our author, and others like them, remain equally facts, which cannot lose their significance, whatever may have occurred since. In the next place, the Vatican Council is not dissolved, but suspended, and must some day reassemble; and until it is over, no one has a right to say what shape its decrees will ultimately assume as a whole. And meanwhile the particular definition to which exception is taken is so framed that it has already received many and most divergent interpretations from divines of unimpeached orthodoxy, without any sign of a disposition on the part of authority to arbitrate between

them. There are those, *e.g.*, who would bring within the range of *ex cathedrâ* and infallible pronouncements a whole host of Bulls, Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Papal utterances, while others limit it to such rigid conditions as are barely satisfied in a single instance in the past.¹ In many quarters, again, the eighty propositions of the Syllabus are treated as *ex cathedrâ* decisions; Dr. Newman dismisses the notion with something like ridicule, and the late Bishop Fessler, General Secretary of the Vatican Council, in a pamphlet published with the formal approbation of the Pope, expressly repudiates it.² Such examples might easily be multiplied;³ but these are enough to show how very little can at present be determined from the language of the decree as interpreted by its reception. And it is only reasonable to infer that, if other difficulties were adjusted, the Vatican Synod need present no insuperable bar to Reunion;⁴ as

¹ "Surely for an *ex cathedrâ* decision of the Pope is required his *formal initiation of it, his authorship of its wording, and his utterance amid his Court, with solemnities parallel to those of an Ecumenical Council.*"—Newman's *Historical Sketches*, vol. iii. p. 340. There is certainly not more than one Papal decision on record to which all, if any, of these tests will apply.

² Newman's *Letter to Duke of Norfolk*, pp. 78 *sqq.*; Fessler's *True and False Infallibility*, p. 5.

³ Father Curci speaks of "the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed" as containing "all that is *per se* necessary to salvation," and of infallibility as "*prerogativa nobilissima riconosciuta nel maestro universale dei Cristiani, e al tempo stesso privilegio non meno nobile conferito all' universale dei Cristiani.*"—*Il Moderno Dissidio*, pp. 3, 14.

⁴ Not however till those in authority have learned to dismiss such marvellous travesties of the doctrines they assail as may be found in the authorised *Report* of the recent Pan-Anglican Conference (p. 35). After a sort of preamble, containing the somewhat superfluous announcement that they "acknowledge but one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus," and "reject any doctrine that would set up other mediators in His place," the Bishops proceed "*therefore*" to warn the faithful that the assumption of Papal infalli-

Leibnitz said, "*fata viam invenient*, for it is God's will." We have already seen that the most eminent Protestant authorities, like Melanchthon, including some of the most capacious intellects the world has ever seen, such as Grotius and Leibnitz, are agreed in maintaining the value, and even necessity, of a primacy in the Church for the preservation of unity among the many and diverse populations included within her fold. And we have also seen that their conviction is confirmed by the instinctive action, if not the verbal acknowledgment, of the Anglican Communion, the moment it begins to aspire to an international life.

Even Luther, in his earlier career (1519), said, "That the Roman Church is more honoured by God

bility "*was an invasion of the attributes of the Lord Jesus Christ.*" Do their Lordships seriously imagine that the Roman Catholic Church, or any member of it, believes in two Mediators, and that the second is the Pope? For, if they do not mean this, the paragraph stands much in need of grammatical revision. But, waiving that point, it is surely obvious *a priori* that our Lord *might* have bestowed on the successor of St. Peter, or on any other authority within His Church, the gift of Divine assistance for infallible exposition of the revealed deposit; the only question is as to the *fact*. That such a gift would involve no invasion of His incommunicable attributes would be sufficiently proved, if only from the fact that according to the universal tradition of Christendom, which many Anglicans profess to respect, He certainly *has* bestowed it on His Church, as is indeed implied in His last commission to the Apostles before His Ascension: "All power is given to Me in heaven *and on earth*. Going *therefore*, make disciples of all nations, . . . *teaching them* to observe whatsoever I have commanded you. And, behold, I am always with you *to the end of the world*" (Matt. xxviii. 18-20). The principle involved in that passage, and repudiated in the extraordinary "warning" of the Lambeth *Report*, lies at the root of the entire teaching and sacramental office of the Church, wherein she throughout *represents the Person*, but does not therefore "invade the attributes," of her Lord. "*As my Father hath sent Me, I also send you*" (John xx. 21). It is no more an invasion of the attributes of Christ to teach with authority in His name, though He is the sole Revealer, than to absolve in His name,

than any other is not to be doubted. . . . The worse things are going the more we should hold close to it, for it is not by separation from it that we can make it better."¹ On the other hand, we have seen how Catholic theologians, prelates, and Popes have deplored the abuses which helped to precipitate, if they did not cause, the schism. Their testimony may be summed up in the language of the pious Möhler, cited with approval in Cardinal Wiseman's *Letter to Lord Shrewsbury*: "The open confession of mutual guilt will be followed by the festival of reconciliation."² To those who put aside such hopes as "visionary and chimerical," or, in the modern phrase of a base and discredited diplomacy, "out of the range of practical politics," it may be replied, in the words of the

though He alone can forgive sins. All this is quite independent of the question of *Papal* infallibility, which must be judged on its own evidence, to which the *Report* makes not the faintest reference. It is a duty to say plainly, and with all respect for those concerned, that this sort of wild rodomontade—I use this phrase with regret, but quite deliberately—can do nothing but unmixed mischief from any intelligible point of view. It embitters controversy, it obscures all the real bearings of the question, and it is sure to provoke angry as well as crushing retort from those at whom it is aimed. And there is something simply grotesque, if the subject were not far too serious for mirth, in inserting in the same document with an exhortation to pray "for the unity of Christendom" a studiously irritating and even absurd caricature of the belief of a large portion of Christendom, more worthy of Dr. Cumming's Apocalyptic reveries than of a grave assembly of prelates and divines. When will controversialists on either side learn that the first condition of coming to an agreement on disputed doctrines is *to avoid deliberately misstating them*? The promise of peace is "*to men of goodwill*." There is the more need to expose this portentous fallacy, as some enthusiastic commentator on the Lambeth manifesto, claiming for it hyper-Papal authority, has actually entitled it, "*The Voice of Jesus to the Churches of the Anglican Communion*."!

¹ D'Aubigné's *Hist. de la Réform.*, vol. ii. pp. 13, 14; quoted in Gladstone's *Church Principles*, p. 293.

² Möhler's *Symbolism*, Eng. Tr., vol. ii. p. 32.

greatest of living statesmen, "When the mind recurs to that most solemn prayer of the Saviour, at that most solemn hour, for the visible unity of His Church, I feel how impossible it is to wrench away the hope of this (however distant and however difficult) achievement from the heart of all true belief in Christ, *with which it is wholly and inseparably inter-twined.*"¹ It is characteristic of the keen discernment and generous frankness of the author, that these words occur in a work published in the early days of the Oxford movement, the year before the appearance of Tract xc., and of Cardinal Wiseman's Letter in response to it, when the idea of Reunion, as an object of definite aim or contemplation, had scarcely as yet dawned on the minds of the most advanced standard-bearers of the new crusade.

There is no need to repeat again what I have drawn out in detail in a former work, already more than once referred to, as to the terrible consequences to the Church, whether in dealing with her own children, or with the outlying heathen world, of the present state of division, alike from the evil temper of mutual suspicion and jealousy it fosters, the huge waste of energy on all sides, the practical heathenism of our great cities, the growing scepticism with which Christian society is honeycombed in every region of Europe,

¹ Gladstone's *Church Principles*, pp. 507, 508. Further extracts are given in the Appendix to my *Letter on the Eirenicon*. But the whole passage, pp. 504-517, is full of interest, though I cannot follow the author in his method of estimating the Council of Trent, which he might perhaps himself be disposed to reconsider in view of later publications, like Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, bearing on the subject.

and the paralysis of all missionary efforts.¹ Nor will I dwell here on what both Dr. Newman and Dr. Pusey have urged with great force, as to the "most serious misfortune" to the Church of the actual bifurcation, broadly speaking, first of the Eastern and Western, and then of the Latin and the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic, nationalities into rival, not to say hostile, camps, which has, to a large extent, impressed on each of the three great divisions of Christendom respectively the exclusive and special characteristics of a particular race or nation ;² whereas the combined experience and distinctive gifts of every race should be represented and harmonized in the world-wide Church, whose essential glory indeed is "from within"—from the indwelling presence of her Lord,—but who is also described in prophecy as "clothed on all sides with varieties" of outward circumstance and state.³ Diversity in unity in a world like this is a note or condition of Catholicism. And hence, even in the natural order, a Church confined within the limits of one race or nation, however widely extended in area, is like a dis severed limb through which the life-blood of the body no longer freely circulates.

Meanwhile, there is one crucial objection, whether secretly cherished or openly avowed, which dogs the steps, and might well nigh chill the heart and choke the voice, however earnest and persuasive, of all who

¹ See *Letter on Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon*, pp. 67 *sqq.*, and cf. Preface to Döllinger's *Lectures on Reunion*.

² See *Apologia*, p. 269 ; cf. *Eirenicon*, p. 259.

³ "Omnis gloria filiæ Regis ab intus, in fimbriis aureis circumamicta varietatibus," Ps. xlv. 15, Vulg.

presume seriously to urge on men's consciences, as a motive of action and a matter of practical interest, the Reunion of Christendom. They are always made to feel that to many of their hearers the most convincing proofs of the evils of division, the clearest exposition of the strength and weakness of former plans and endeavours for effecting an union, and of future possibilities of success, will sound as idle tales. They will not discuss, they will not consider, they will hardly deign to listen to them. One word is enough to settle the whole business, and put all who are concerned in it out of court without a hearing: they are *enthusiasts*, and for a large section of society—I must take leave to say neither the most intelligent nor the most deserving of respect—the English vocabulary contains no more damning term. Well, be it so. I am content to reply with the three Hebrew boys who, precisely because they were enthusiasts for their God, were flung into the fiery furnace at Babylon: “We are not careful to answer you in this matter.” Certainly we are enthusiasts, and we are not ashamed of it. Why indeed should we be ashamed of a name which associates us with the best, the noblest, the wisest, the truest benefactors of mankind in every age? Without enthusiasm no great deliverance was ever wrought, no great work for the honour of God or the service of His creatures ever accomplished, in the history of the world. What but enthusiasm for truth shaped the life and cheered the martyr-death of Socrates? What but patriotic enthusiasm fired the soul and nerved the arm of the Hellenic heroes of Thermopylæ or Marathon?

What but the enthusiasm of faith inspired the first Crusaders when "the will of God" flashed down like the fires of Pentecost on ten thousand hearts, and broke in one passion of acclaim from ten thousand tongues at Clermont? What but enthusiasm prompted and carried to its fulfilment "the unshared grandeur of the dream" of that marvellous man—

"The immortal Genoese, the demigod
Of modern legend, who upon that sea,
Sublimely overshadowed by a cloud
Of ignorant faiths, once turned his dipping prow
Right onward to discover worlds unknown" ?¹

What but enthusiasm inspired the prophet-voice of Savonarola, alike in the pulpit and at the stake? What else sustained the apostolic zeal of Xavier or of Henry Martyn through a life of toil and trial? What else, to come to a later day, has secured for William Wilberforce an immortal name, who, through evil report and good report, in spite of disappointment, contempt, ridicule, reproach, fought out a noble cause, and won a better triumph than any the arts of diplomacy or the warrior's sword can claim? But why should I multiply examples? All history, secular or sacred, ancient or modern, is full of them. Suffice it to add, in the words of a recent writer, which are much to our present purpose, that our Lord "contemplated a Church in which the enthusiasm of humanity should not be felt by two or three only, but widely. For a lukewarm Church He would not condescend to legislate."² Or rather, on such a Church He has pronounced a terrible anathema.³ We may well then be more

¹ Faber's *Sir Lancelot*, Bk. vi.

² *Ecce Homo*, p. 256.

³ Apoc. iii. 16.

than patient under the reproach of an enthusiasm which takes for its object the greatest service that can be conferred on humanity, while it rests on the strength of a Divine promise, and is sustained by the abiding power of the Redeemer's dying prayer.

Nor let Anglicans reply that for them at least this is a matter of secondary interest, in comparison with what has come to be not very happily designated "Home Reunion," or the reconciliation of Dissenters to the Church. In the first place, that is not the fact. There are from six to seven million Roman Catholics in Great Britain and Ireland, while, if America and the Colonies be included, about a third of our English-speaking brethren are Catholics; and to be in unity instead of in rivalry with them cannot be otherwise than of supreme importance to the National Church, especially in view of disestablishment. In the next place, Anglicans, if they are true to their own principles, have much more in common with us than with Dissenters, and it is reasonable to strive first for reconciliation with those who are least widely removed from you. And lastly, experience proves, what might have been pretty surely anticipated, that the isolated efforts of the English Church to recover the allegiance of Nonconformists are never likely to be crowned with more at best than very partial success; while, at the same time, Dissent, however strong as a political power, is visibly in a state of religious disintegration; *mole ruit sud.* On the other hand, there can be little doubt, as Cardinal Wiseman pointed out many years ago, that if the National Church were restored to

Catholic unity, "Dissent would break in pieces beneath the silent action of universal attraction, and its fragments gather round its all-powerful principle." Without any desire then to disparage efforts in the direction of "Home Reunion," I hold it clear that, even from a purely Anglican and insular point of view, a transcendently greater interest and importance attaches to the corporate unity of Christendom. If the latter were secured, the first would be its natural sequel ; the greater includes the less.

It is sometimes objected by those who shrink from directly challenging the principle, that their circumstances preclude them from giving it more than an otiose assent. Their engagements are too pressing, or their influence too small, to allow of their offering any practical aid in so vast an enterprise. Such an excuse, if it is sincere, is based on a complete misapprehension. Every one of course has his own special gifts and opportunities, for which he must render an account. But there are none, however humble their position, or however busy their lives, who cannot do much towards the promotion of a work which is the common duty and privilege of all who name the Name of Christ, or who are not in fact, whether consciously or unconsciously, doing much, day by day, to promote or to thwart it. All contribute something in their respective spheres towards the formation of public opinion ; all are doing something by daily word and example to foster the temper of union or of strife ; all can do much by habitual and earnest intercession, and more by the cultivation of personal holiness, which

is the secret of power both with God and man.¹ Sanctity stands between Unity and Catholicity among the notes of the Church in the Creed, and for this reason among others, that on the subjective side her unity and universality are largely dependent on the holiness of her children, though of course there is a sense in which all the four notes, being matter of faith, are absolute and inalienable. Moral corruption, as in the age of the Reformation, is the occasion and instrument of schism, and moral renovation is the first condition of reunion. The "new commandment" of charity, which gives its name to Maundy-Thursday, is the primal law, as the Sacrifice of the new Dispensation, which accompanied its delivery, is the primal ordinance of the Catholic Church. "The meek shall inherit the earth, and shall be refreshed in the multitude of peace."

To those—and they are not a few—who have the hardihood to affirm that the object of Reunion is itself an unpractical one, and that the divided state of Christendom, however incongruous in the abstract, or offensive to the taste of ecclesiastical purists, is a merely sentimental grievance, a more than sufficient answer has been already given. Without dwelling here on the notorious and violent contradiction of

¹ See Sermon on "Personal Holiness an Instrument and Condition of Unity," in the Second Series of *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom*. While referring to my own words, I would take the opportunity of calling attention to another and very striking Sermon in the same volume, signed "L.," and attributed to one of the first living preachers and divines in the Church of England, on "The Difficulties of Reunion," which are shown in detail to afford no plausible pretext for apathy or discouragement.

their view to the express teaching of the New Testament, I will but remind such reasoners, in the briefest terms, of three typical facts, any one of which alone would amply suffice to refute it. In the first place, the actual heathenism of vast multitudes in nominally Christian countries, like our own, is mainly due to the wranglings of rival religionists, who are too much occupied in mutual bickerings to have time or energy to devote to the work of evangelizing them. A fourth, at the very lowest computation, of the inhabitants of London and our other great towns, is left to grow up and die unbaptized, while of those who are christened too many know nothing of the first rudiments of the Christian faith. Take, again, the defects or abuses of different kinds abounding in every Communion. The same explanation must be given of the almost impossibility of any effectual attempt to reform them. There is a familiar proverb against washing dirty linen in public, and it is the instinct, if not the interest, of the adherents of every separate Church or sect to magnify the faults of rival systems and conceal their own. In the middle ages there was no such temptation, while all Europe belonged to one great Christian family, and the dirty linen, whenever submitted to the process, could only be washed at home. And accordingly mediæval writers, prelates, and Councils expose and denounce the prevalent corruptions of their own day with a frankness, not to say a fierceness, which has sometimes misled later critics and historians into an exaggerated estimate of the facts. The Reformation changed all

that, and by ranging Catholics and Protestants in opposite camps, in an attitude of unnatural hostility and distrust, put each party, as it were, on their honour to admit nothing they could help to the disadvantage of their own side, or to the credit of their opponents. It might almost be said of the rival apologists and assailants,—

“ His honour rooted in dishonour stood,
And faith unfaithful made him falsely true.”

But reform is hopeless of abuses that are jealously hushed up; and the first hint of exposure is still greeted with an indignant outcry of betrayal of sacred interests to the enemy. Corruptions which thrive under the cold shade of mutual suspicion would spontaneously die out, with the fatal reserve which fosters them, in the bracing atmosphere of a reunited Christendom.

The third and last result of disunion I shall notice here, is what Döllinger justly calls “the oppressive thought” of the present condition of the heathen world, eighteen centuries since the Divine commission was given on the Mount of Ascension to make disciples of all nations. Buddhism alone, with from four to five hundred million adherents, comprising a full third of the inhabitants of the world, greatly outnumber the aggregate of professing Christians of every Church or creed.¹ And where Buddhism ends

¹ It is difficult, amid conflicting testimonies, and the differences of rival Buddhist sects, to gain any certain information, but there seems to be great room for doubt whether Buddhism recognises any God, in the theistic sense of the word.

Brahmanism begins, with some 140 millions more. Still more repulsive to the Christian mind is the rule of Islam over at least 120 millions of mankind, whose numbers are constantly increasing, not only because it is the foulest and most desolating form of misbelief God's earth was ever cursed with—as recent experience has too abundantly taught us,—but even more because from one point of view it may be regarded, as Schlegel points out, as a form rather of heresy than of heathenism pure and simple,¹ and its ranks have from the first been largely, if not chiefly, recruited by unwilling renegades, bribed or entrapped or dragooned into apostasy from the faith of Christ. It has all along owed its successes, almost its existence, to making capital out of the discord of Christians, and hence “there is no other religion which has so deeply-rooted a hatred to Christianity, and that hatred is engrained into every nation which embraces it.”² At this moment it is gaining proselytes among the natives of India, who have been impressed but not attracted by the edifying spectacle of the contention of some twenty rival Churches and sects, which bid against one another for their allegiance;³ it has

¹ Schlegel's *Philosophy of History*, pp. 326 *sqq.*, English Translation, Bohn's Library.

² Döllinger's *Reunion of the Churches*, p. 19.

³ During the Moslem rule in India a sixth of the native population were gained over to that faith. Have we converted a six-hundredth portion of the remainder to ours? See two interesting papers on Christianity in India, and the true explanation and practical bearings of our policy in the matter, by “M. T.,” in *Fraser's Magazine* for September and December 1877. Only exception must be taken to the writer's paradoxical assertion that the differences of Christians form no real hindrance to the work of conversion, because “the history of Christianity shows that the periods when Chris-

even, to our shame be it spoken, won over Christians—whom it can no longer kidnap or enslave—to its creed of lust and blood. On the whole, between two-thirds and three-fourths of the population of the world still lies in the outer darkness of heathenism, and that, by the general admission of those best capable of judging, chiefly because the followers of Jesus are no longer one, and therefore the world does *not* believe that God hath sent Him. “The majority of mankind remain buried in darkness, *because we bring them a Gospel divided, disputed, cut up into fragments*. If England, France, and Russia were agreed in the truth, and therefore in the charity and zeal of the apostolate, the face of the East, of the whole world, would be changed.”¹ It would be easy enough to multiply testimonies, but the late Bishop Selwyn, the highest Anglican authority on missions to the heathen, may be taken as spokesman for his brethren.² And it is worth noting as a typical fact, that, in the hideous persecution of Catholic missionaries and converts in Japan between two and three centuries ago—when Christianity was for the time literally stamped out, *per simplicem enumerationem*, in the blood of all the Christians in the island—the Dutch Protestants, who had themselves exhibited an ostentatious alacrity in dancing on the crucifix, were the main instigators and

tianity made its greatest advances have often been those when extreme doctrinal dissensions existed among Christians themselves.” The whole history of Christianity, from first to last, conspicuously and unmistakably shows exactly the reverse.

¹ Dupanloup, *La Convention et L'Encyclique*, p. 127.

² See *Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge*, pp. 56 *sqq.*

abettors of the Government policy.¹ That is no doubt an extreme case, but it may serve to illustrate the action of "our common Christianity" on the heathen world.² Let so much suffice, though it is the merest tithe of what might be adduced, in reply to those who sneer at the desire for Reunion, as a whim of ecclesiastical etiquette, based on a "sentimental grievance."

And now may the Most Merciful bless this and every work designed for His honour and the service and increase of His Church. May He turn the hearts, and utterly confound and bring to nought the schemes, the aspirations, and the aims of all, of whatever country, class, or creed—whether worldlings, sceptics, politicians, prelates, or divines—who, from evil will or a zeal not according to knowledge, would thwart His gracious purpose. May He bless and prosper with His most abundant benediction every thought and effort and intercession of those who would contribute, though it be but as the widow's mite, to hasten the perfect fulfilment of the Redeemer's dying prayer, till His will be done on earth as it is in heaven, and the kingdom and power and

¹ This fact is noticed by Mr. Baring Gould in his graphic sketch of the almost incredible horrors of the Japanese persecution, *Lives of the Saints*, volume for February, pp. 141 *seqq.* A great many of the martyrs, as in the early ages, were children, who displayed an heroic fortitude worthy of Pancratius or Agnes.

² "In these words (John xvii. 23) a visible unity, a unity such as the world could recognise, whatever depths it has besides, is made the token, or the condition, as we view it, of that glory in which the Church was to be clad."—Newman, *Prophetical Office of the Church.* (*Via Media*, vol. i. p. 199.)

greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven is given to the people of the Saints of the Most High, and all kings and nations serve Him, and there is one fold and one Shepherd.

With these words of introductory comment I commend the following Essay to the serious and devout attention of the Christian reader, of whatever school or communion ; and I would once more earnestly entreat him not to put aside what so intimately concerns the highest interests of Christianity and of the human race, it may be of his own soul also, as an antiquarian curiosity or a visionary dream. We have seen that of the authorship nothing can now be certainly ascertained. But it need not detract from the value or interest of the work, that it comes from one of the many who, in their generation, have longed and laboured for peace, whose names are unknown on earth, but whose memories are fragrant, and their forgotten graves for ever musical with the angel-whisper of the Beatitude he has chosen for his own : *Beati pacifici, quoniam filii Dei vocabuntur.*

H. N. O.

Original Title-page.]

A N
E S S A Y
T O W A R D S A
P R O P O S A L
F O R
CATHOLIC COMMUNION.

W H E R E I N

Above Sixty of the principal controverted Points,
which have hitherto divided Christendom,
being called over, it is examined, how many
of them may, and ought to be laid aside,
and how few remain to be accommodated,
for the effecting a General Peace.

B Y A

MINISTER of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

L O N D O N : P R I N T E D :
(JOHN NUTT, NEAR STATIONERS HALL, 1704),
A N D , D U B L I N : R E - P R I N T E D ,
B Y G E O R G E B O N H A M , .
F O R T H O M A S W A L K E R , N o . 7 9 , D A M E - S T R E E T ;
A N D S O L D B Y R . C R O S S , A N D P . W O G A N ,
B R I D G E - S T R E E T .

oooooooooooooooooooo

M.DCC.LXXXI.

THE PREFACE.

THOSE who have read the ancient Fathers, and observed with what severity they pronounce against schism, will easily find an apology for this Essay, as far as it aims at the healing of divisions amongst the Christian Churches. And those who have observed how much Cassander, Grotius, Forbes, and others, have laboured in composing the differences of the Reformed Churches with the Church of Rome, so to close up that great breach which has been so long between them, will readily excuse the attempt here made of pursuing the same charitable design in regard of our own Church.

It is a point I have been long considering, and a work for which I have now for some years been preparing, omitting no opportunity of books or other information that could give me an insight into the state of our division. And because I was sensible how absolutely necessary an impartial hand was for carrying on this design, therefore my great solicitude was, how to break that bias which education, study, and interest had given me in disfavour of the Church of Rome. Upon which consideration I concluded it

the most unsuspected method, not to take information of that Church, either from my own idea of it, or from any adversary, but to let it speak for itself; and accordingly, without asking questions of any that are without, I have gone into it as far as was lawful in my station; I have gone into its Councils, into its profession of faith, into its most approved catechisms, into its liturgy, into its most solemn offices, and have everywhere both inquired and searched, what it teaches, what it forbids, what it allows, and what it discourages.

This I judged to be a way most free from exceptions, as having had the experience how many mistakes there are in what is taken up upon credit, especially where party or prejudice bring the report in suspicion, and not thinking it at all reasonable to trust others, in a case where I was not only jealous, but afraid to trust myself.

In this method then I have inquired of the Church of Rome what are the articles of her communion. I have given her the liberty of expounding her own terms, of declaring in what sense she understands her own doctrine, and proposes it to others to be believed; and as she delivers it, so I have set it down, *not asserting* anything myself, but only *making a report* of it in an *historical* manner, as it is delivered by her, and therefore have no concern in defending, but only in the faithful relation of it.

And because my design is to see if anything can be done, in order to remove or lessen the debates between the Church of England and that of Rome, therefore I

must freely own I have in every point inquired what is the most moderate sense in which the doctrine of the Roman Church is delivered by her own pastors, such as are within her communion, without being censured for what they so teach.

I have done the same on our side, examining how far is granted by those who seem to be men of learning and temper; not charging the opinions of such particular Doctors upon our Church, but to see how far it is tolerated at least, if not allowed within our pale; and while in this, I have made choice of such chiefly, whose dignity has made them eminent, whose learning challenges respect, and whose labour in the study of antiquity qualifies them for speaking in this point; I hope so much deference will be had to them, that their depositions may be allowed in all such cases where the question is of what was taught and believed in the primitive Church; and there will be judged no necessity at least of separate communion upon the account of such points, which these positively maintain within our own communion, and as positively assert to be primitive truths.

By this way I have examined the principal controverted questions between the two Churches, and by reducing them to certain rules proper in this case, have considered how many of them may be compounded, how many be laid by, and which are the remaining differences which still want an accommodation. I hope, upon the whole, it will appear that something is here advanced, in order to a common peace, enough to give encouragement to others to

pursue this healing method. For my part, I desire no peace, if it cannot be obtained without consenting to error or sin ; but if it can be procured upon any easier terms, if submitting to inconvenience or surrendering an interest be the conditions proposed, I should not think them hard for so public a good as Catholic communion and peace of the Church. In this method, and with this disposition of mind, have I proceeded in the following Essay. If anything be there offered serviceable to this public end, I shall rejoice ; and if anything be advanced too far through oversight, to the prejudice of any Gospel truth, I leave it to the examination of those in power, to whose censure I submit all mistakes.

THE CONTENTS.

	PAGE
<i>The Preface,</i>	99
<i>The Occasion of this Essay,</i>	105
CHAP. I. <i>Rules and Principles for proceeding in this Essay,</i>	111
CHAP. II. <i>Of the Pope,</i>	119
CHAP. III. <i>Of the Invocation of Saints and Angels,</i>	149
CHAP. IV. <i>Of Images,</i>	160
CHAP. V. <i>Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the Real Presence,</i>	171
§ I. <i>Of the Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist,</i>	177
§ II. <i>Of the Manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist,</i>	179
§ III. <i>Something more particular as to the Manner,</i>	182
§ IV. <i>Of Transubstantiation,</i>	187
§ V. <i>Of the Mass,</i>	198
CHAP. VI. <i>Of Communion in one Kind,</i>	202
CHAP. VII. <i>Of praying for the Dead, and Purgatory,</i>	211

	PAGE
CHAP. VIII. <i>Of Penances, Indulgences, and the Number of Sacraments,</i>	222
CHAP. IX. <i>Of Confession, Repentance, and the Pardon of Sins,</i>	231
CHAP. X. <i>Of Merit, Satisfaction, Works of Supererogation, and Relics,</i>	240
CHAP. XI. <i>Of breeding People in Ignorance, of praying in an unknown Tongue, and forbidding the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue,</i>	248
CHAP. XII. <i>Of Tradition, Miracles, Implicit Faith, and Uncharitableness,</i>	256
CHAP. XIII. <i>Of leaving out one of the Com- mandments, of not keeping Faith with Heretics, and of doing Evil that Good may come of it,</i>	262
CHAP. XIV. <i>Of murdering Protestants, of the Plots, Treasons, and Massacres by Papists,</i>	268
CHAP. XV. <i>Of Antichrist and the Idolatry of Rome,</i>	275
CHAP. XVI. <i>Of Ceremonies, the Crucifix, and Lights on the Altar, Incense, Sign of the Cross, and Holy Water,</i>	279
CHAP. XVII. <i>Of the great Averseness in the Romanists, against the English Ministry,</i>	288
CHAP. XVIII. <i>The Conclusion,</i>	296

AN ESSAY
TOWARDS A
PROPOSAL FOR CATHOLIC
COMMUNION.

The Occasion of this Essay.

BEING appointed to preach a Visitation sermon, I soon judged the Unity of the Church to be a proper subject for the acquitting myself in such a manner as might be suitable to the assembly which I was to expect ; and, though an accident diverted me then from that argument, I have since resumed it, and gone on with those studies, wherein I always took great delight. But as this had its charm, so it met with an allay. For I confess I was struck, upon reflecting, how far we come short of the beauty and glory of the primitive Church. I observed the ancient Church, as one body throughout the world, wherein all national Churches were united. Then, turning home, I sighed, and cried out to myself : Is not this a great blemish to our Church, that we are in communion with no part of the Christian world ; that we are separated from all ; that in our island, which is but as an atom in comparison of the universe, we are

not even united among ourselves, but have as many divisions as can be found in all Christendom besides ?¹ Here the love and zeal for that Church in which I ever lived, drew tears from me of compassion and grief; I could not but lament the narrow bounds of its communion. But as so great a concern, in all other cases, is naturally attended with desires of relief, and turns the thoughts every way to see if by any, and by what means, there can be hopes of redress; so I began to judge it more reasonable to consider of help than to waste my spirits in useless complaints. Hence I applied my whole consideration to examine if there was no means could be proposed for taking off the stain from our Church, by enlarging her communion, and restoring her to her primitive state.

This thought met indeed with discouragement enough to render it abortive. For I could not but see such a temper at home, as might cut off all hopes of accommodation; I saw the breach so wide between us and the Church of Rome, that I could foresee no likelihood of its being healed. But that zeal, that love for our Church, which first put me upon looking about for the remedy of its unhappy condition, would not let me despair. It suggested that difficulties ought not to discourage the proposals of a public good, that something is to be attempted, upon the confidence of an overruling Providence, improving oftentimes weak endeavours for the carrying on the

¹ [According to *Whitaker's Almanack* for 1878, more than 150 different sects have registered places of worship in England and Wales.]

greatest works, beyond what could be expected from the prospect of human reason. Some such arguments were enough to a willing mind, and hereupon I made it my business to inquire what method might probably be serviceable in order to the great end I proposed.

Inclination first led me most pressingly to consider this with regard to all that dissent from us at home; for I cannot but own my strongest bent is to do good to my own country and nation, and the first glory of a national Church is to be united within itself. But then, reflecting that the unity I proposed was of a greater extent than the bounds of our island, and that the communion I desired, and most peculiar to Christianity, was not national only but Catholic; hence I saw myself obliged to pass our seas, and examine the much more considerable division from us, I mean, whatever is in communion with the See of Rome; and upon a full consideration of each party, I observed at length that Popery was at the bottom of all;¹ that this kept us divided from so many foreign Churches abroad, and that the same was made the grounds of our divisions at home; so that this being the true occasion of the narrowness of our communion, and of our standing divided from all Christian Churches, there could be no likelihood of our Church

¹ [The terms "Popery" and "Papist" have acquired an offensive connotation, which ought to banish them from all modern controversy. The author evidently uses them simply to designate the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Pope, and those who acknowledge it, without any intention of ridicule or reproach. The same may be said of the cognate terms "Romanism" and "Romanist."]

being bettered, except there could be some accommodation found in this grand affair.

Hence, to pursue my design, I was cast upon the necessity of examining all the doctrines of Popery, to see if there was any possibility of lessening the controversy between us, and in particular, to inquire whether there could not be communion with that Church, without approving, or consenting to, the many scandals, cruelties, errors, superstitions, and idolatries which commonly make up her character.

On this single point I plainly saw all depended, and it seemed as evident to me, that if, upon my inquiry, I could either give hope, or prepare things for an accommodation of such differences, as have hitherto kept us divided from the greatest part of Christendom, and likewise occasioned divisions amongst ourselves; it would be service to our Church, in opening by one expedient a way to peace both at home and abroad, and preparing for Catholic communion, which as it was the ornament of the primitive, so it ought to be the glory now of every part of the Catholic Church.

This task, I foresaw, could not fail of being attended with personal inconveniences, and laying me under an ill name. But however, I saw reason enough still to encourage the undertaking. For certainly, if schisms and divisions are the scandal of the Church, and the triumph of devils, it must needs be commendable to use all endeavours for removing or lessening them. If contentions and religious wars are the overthrow of religion, the love of God and religion must encourage

the proposal of all lawful expedients for the restoring of peace.

Well, and upon these principles do I think it reasonable to open the communion of our Church, and to let in Popery ? No, far be this thought from me ; I enter here a protestation against idolatry and superstition, and whatsoever is opposite to the rules of the Gospel. But at the same time, it may be reasonable to do here as we generally do with the worst of our enemies. For, if carrying on war with such is considerably prejudicial to the State, it is certainly no disservice to the public to see how near we can come to peace, and to inquire if there be no possibility of removing any of those things which are laid hold on as the just occasion of prosecuting the war.

So far as this I may propose in the case of all our religious wars ; and if for so doing I am traduced as a Papist, I value it not. I am contented with the worst of slanders, so I can any ways contribute to the removing of schism. I embrace all that ignorance and malice can invent, so I can but be so happy as to do anything for taking off the infamous character given the Christian world, and restore our Church to the beauty and order of the primitive. If I can but even remotely prepare for so good a work, I shall not set any personal inconveniencies in the balance against it ; being assured that while the rash, furious, and schismatical brains express their gall, I shall have the encouragement of the better part, the judicious, sober, and pious, who at present lament the unhappy state of our Church.

In order to what I have here proposed, I intend to touch at the most considerable controversies that are between the two Churches. Not to dispute them over again, for that has been sufficiently done by many learned pens; but to see if there be any of those points can be laid aside, which have hitherto been made the subject of most uncharitable heats, and increased our division. If I find any such, and mark them out, I shall so far concur to the lessening the number of our contentions, as likewise to examine in what points the controversy sticks, upon the decision of which our common peace and even Catholic communion depends; and if these can be reduced to a slender number, I hope it may be a service to the public, and that hence some pious souls and lovers of unity will be encouraged to see if there be a possibility of doing anything for the composing of them.

CHAPTER I.

Rules and Principles for proceeding in this Essay.

FOR better discovering if there be any point of controversy which can and ought to be laid aside, and proceeding more clearly in this important subject, I set down some rules relating to Church communion, and principally those prescribed by the Most Reverend Dr. Sharp, Archbishop of York, in his sermon preached before the Lord Mayor at Guildhall Chapel, 1674 ;¹ where, having learnedly and zealously pressed our dissenters with obligation of Church-communion, he labours to remove the occasions of the schism ; and that all may pursue these things that make for peace, he gives some rules which seem evident above dispute.

The first rule is, *To distinguish carefully between matters of faith and matters of opinion ; and as to these latter, to be willing that every one should enjoy the liberty of judging for himself.* And consequently that matters

¹ [John Sharp (1644-1714), Rector of St. Giles's in the Fields and Dean of Norwich, was a famous preacher, and a man of high character, piety, and learning. He became Archbishop of York in 1691. The seventh edition of his Sermons appeared in 1738, and the rules from which our author has borrowed are contained in the first sermon of vol. i.]

of opinion ought to be no hindrance to communion with a Church which imposes no such opinions on its members, but leaves every one to judge in such matters as seems most reasonable to them.¹

Another rule is, *That errors in a Church as to matter of doctrines, or corruptions as to matter of practice, so long as these errors and corruptions are only suffered, but not imposed, cannot be a sufficient cause of separation; the reason is, because these things are not sins in us, so long as we do not join with the Church in them.* So that, so long as we can communicate with a Church without either professing her errors, or partaking in her sinful practices, as in the present case it is supposed we may do; so long we are bound, upon the principle before laid down, not to separate from her, and consequently such errors in doctrines, or corruptions in practice, ought to be no hindrance to communion.²

A third rule is, *Never to quarrel about words and phrases, but so long as other men mean much what the same that we do, let us be content though they have not the luck to express themselves so well.* Where it is also noted how it often happens that most bitter quarrels do commence, not so much from the different sense of the contending parties concerning the things they contend about, as from the different terms expressing

¹ [The justice of this rule is obvious, as soon as it is stated, but it is too often forgotten in practice.]

² [This again is obvious. As Dr. Newman says (*Letter on Pusey's Eirenicon*, p. 86), "*A people's religion is ever a corrupt religion*, in spite of the provisions of Holy Church . . . if you make use of religion to impress them, they will make use of religion to corrupt it."]

the same sense, and the different grounds they proceed upon, or arguments they make use of for the proof of it; and consequently that difference of terms and phrases ought to be no hindrance to communion.

A fourth rule is, *Never to charge upon men the consequences of their opinions, when they expressly disown them.* Where it is also to be observed that this is another thing doth hugely tend to widen our differences, and to exasperate men's spirits one against another; when having examined some opinion of a man, or party of men, and finding very great absurdities and evil consequences necessarily to flow from it, we presently throw all those into the dish of them that hold the opinion, as if they could not own the one, but they must necessarily own the other; whereas, indeed, the men we thus charge may be so innocent in this matter, that they do not in the least dream of such consequences; or if they did, they would be so far from owning them, that they would abhor the opinion for their sakes.

A fifth rule is, *That unscriptural impositions are not a warrantable cause of separation from a Church; supposing that by unscriptural be meant no more than what is neither commanded nor forbid in the Scriptures.* For the actions required by these unscriptural impositions are either in themselves lawful to be done, or not lawful to be done. If they be in themselves unlawful to be done, then they do not fall under that notion of unscriptural we here speak of; they are downright sins, and so either particularly, or in the general, forbid in the Scripture. If they be in themselves lawful to be

done, then it cannot be imagined how their being commanded can make them unlawful : so that in this case there is no sin in yielding obedience to the Church, and consequently no cause of withdrawing our communion from it.

A sixth rule is, *That there are but two cases wherein it can be lawful to withdraw our communion from a Church, because there are but two cases wherein communion with her can be sinful. One is, when the Church requires of us, as a condition of her communion, an acknowledgment and profession of that for a truth which we know to be an error. The other is, when the Church requires of us, as a condition of her communion, the joining with her in some practices which we know to be against the laws of God.* In these two cases, to withdraw our obedience to the Church is so far from being a sin that it is a necessary duty, because we have an obligation to the laws of God antecedent to that we have to those of the Church ; and we are bound to obey these no farther than they are consonant or agreeable to those.

These are assertions and rules gathered out of this sermon, though not set down all in this order ; and though directed only to the Dissenters, yet are so very well grounded, just, and reasonable in themselves, that they ought to be observed in all cases where the question is of Church communion ; so far (and I dare boldly say it) that there is no Christian Church in the world can pretend its communion to be reasonable or even lawful which will not allow of these rules. For, to touch at some of them, What Church can

pretend its communion to be lawful, if matters of opinion and bare school decisions are allowed a just exception against communicating with it? Or who can be a member of any Church, if it be on condition to approve all the opinions of men, or parties of men, that are in communion with it? Again, Where is the Church whose communion is lawful, if there be a necessity of approving all the corrupt practices of men, or party of men, that are or have been in it? Hence it must be allowed by all Churches that matters of opinion or corrupt practices, which are not imposed on any, are not a sufficient exception against communicating with them.

Again, that consequences ought not to be charged, is what all Churches are concerned in, since there is none but whose doctrines are or may be rendered monstrous by consequential absurdity, according to the reasoning at least of adverse parties. And therefore, for preventing the overthrow of all peace, all have reason to compound in the allowance of this principle. Especially, too, since the highest truth of Christianity must be exposed to the liberties of blaspheming and impious tongues, if common reason shall be allowed to describe them in all their seeming evident consequences.

All Churches are likewise concerned in the fifth rule of unscriptural impositions, such as are neither commanded nor forbid in Scripture. Since there is no Christian congregation, which has the face of a Church, but what claims this right, and likewise practises it, and therefore cannot make that a suffi-

cient objection against communion but by destroying itself.¹

But, if there be any Christian Church so well circumstanced as not to be necessitated to allow of these rules, yet I think I may own it without casting any blemish on our Church, I may own it, I say, that ours does and must allow of them ; since it would not be reasonable to expect any to communicate with us, if we make it a condition of communion to subscribe or approve all the opinions or corrupt practices there are or have been found in the members, or even pastors of it. This is what no Christian Church can pretend to, there being no Church which is not forced to tolerate many opinions and corrupt practices in some of its members, which it cannot think reasonable to impose on such as desire to be incorporated in it.

If then we allow these rules, in order to the removing mistakes and lessening controversies with such as here at home dissent from us, it seems just we should observe the same rules in the examining all other controversies, and think it reasonable to lay aside all such contentions as according to these rules are, or ought to be, no obstruction to communion. So far the love of justice and desire of Christian peace seem to oblige us. And, if (as Prov. xx. 10), “divers weights and divers measures are both of them alike abomination to the Lord” in all cases, though but of common dealings betwixt man and man, they must

¹ [This is of course obvious as soon as it is stated. The Quaker dress, *e.g.* is just as much an “unscriptural imposition,” in the sense here defined, as the use of the wedding-ring or of holy water.]

be much more so in cases on which depend the peace of the Christian world. Upon the consideration of which common peace, and upon the desire that Catholic communion may be again restored to the world, which was the honour and beauty of the primitive Church, and is so much sighed for by many pious and learned men, I proceed to examine the controversial debates which are between the two Churches, and taking these rules along with me, will see according to this measure which points may be laid down, and ought not to obstruct communion ; as likewise which they are which are still to be insisted on, as requiring a public accommodation, before there can be that universal communion which is desired. But while I speak of Catholic communion, and often in this Essay mention communion with the Roman Church, I here declare I intend no communion infringing the rights and liberties of our national Church, but only such as was formerly in the primitive Church, when all bishops of the earth were known by their communicatory letters ; when they saluted one another by the name of brethren and colleagues ; when each bishop maintained the rights of his own Church, and expressed a zeal for, and was concerned in, the good of the whole ; when charity cemented divided nations into one body, and of all believers made one kingdom, one mystical body of Christ. Such a Catholic communion is what I propose, it is what I earnestly desire, it is the only meaning of all that is in this little Essay ; and therefore I desire the candid reader to stretch no expressions beyond

this sense, for if he does, I here renounce it as an imposition. Now, since our controversial divisions are the chief obstruction of this desirable unity, therefore I must here see how far these may be lessened. And I shall begin with that which abounds with the greatest difficulties.

CHAPTER II.

Of the Pope.

UNDER this head, of so great import, there are several controversial points, which have occasioned great heats, and helped to keep open the breach between the two Churches. These I shall set down in order, and having considered them in short, shall then apply the rule to them, and see what is the result.

QUEST. I. Whether the Pope be infallible in his definitions and doctrines, so that all who are in communion with him are bound to receive and believe them, as unquestionable truths?

This, in a great part, is so taught by Bellarmine, and if the point were, upon what terms we were to be in communion with Bellarmine, it is certain it could not be but by subscribing such an infallibility. But our question is about the communion with his Church. And having found, upon strict examination, that the Church in communion with the See of Rome requires no assent to such a Papal infallibility: that it is not so much as mentioned in the definition of the Council of Florence, in which the controversy of the Papal authority and prerogative was professedly and fully discussed: that it is not in the formula of faith set forth by Pope Pius IV. collected out of the Council of

Trent, and of which all promoted to Church dignities are obliged to make a solemn profession : that it is not proposed to such as are admitted members into that communion : that it has no place, either in their *Catechism ad Parochos*, nor in other Catechisms which are for the general instruction of the people :¹ having found likewise that Bellarmine owns five eminent doctors positively denying this infallibility of the Pope, without being censured by their Church for such their tenets :² that the famous Launoius reckons up twelve Universities, Bononia, Pavia, Sienna in Italy, Louvain in Belgia, Cologne and Hertford in Germany, Vienna in Austria, Cracow in Poland, Anjou, Orleans, Toulouse, and Paris in France, and besides these numerous bodies, seven-and-fifty single writers, amongst which are many eminent bishops, archbishops, and cardinals—viz., seventeen of the Parisian school, three of the Spanish, one of Oxford, five Germans, and no less than one-and-

¹ [The *Catechismus ad Parochos* was drawn up by the direction of the Council of Trent, and first published, after the close of the Council, in 1566, with the approbation of Pius IV., as a manual for the use of pastors in the work of catechetical instruction. It does not therefore possess the same formal authority as the decrees of the Council itself, and in the controversy *De Auxiliis* at Rome (on the relation of grace to freewill) the Jesuits objected to its being appealed to as an authoritative symbolical document, and the objection was allowed. (See Möhler's *Symbolism*, vol. i. pp. 18-20, Eng. Trans.) But it possesses, as it deserves, the highest authority short of this. It contains a clear and lucid exposition of Catholic belief, admirably suited for purposes of pastoral instruction, following the order of the successive articles of the Apostles' Creed, the doctrine of the Sacraments, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer. Dr. Newman has stated that he rarely preaches a sermon without going to "this beautiful and complete Catechism" to get both his matter and his doctrine.—*Hist. of Religious Opinions*, p. 280.]

² Bellarm., *De Rom. Pont.* iv. 2. [The five doctors named are Nilus, Gerson, Alma, Alphonsus de Castro, and Adrian VI. The list might of course easily be lengthened.]

thirty in Italy alone—all professedly writing against this infallibility of the Pope, without any censure passed against them from that Church ;¹ having found, I say, this, it seems evident from hence, that this Papal infallibility is no term of communion with that Church ; that it is no more than a matter of opinion, and not of faith ; and consequently, that according to our first rule, this question ought to be laid aside by the lovers of peace, and not made an obstruction to Catholic communion, since within the communion of the Roman Church this infallibility of the Pope may be, and is, as stiffly opposed as by those that are out of it. And why, then, should our undue heats be kept up upon this account, whereas that Church obliges not its members to assent to any such doctrine ?

QUEST. II. Whether those in communion with the Church of Rome are bound to believe virtue to be wicked, and vice to be good, if it shall please His Holiness to say so ?

This is nowhere declared in the Councils of Florence or Trent ; it has no place in any profession of their faith, it is not taught in their Catechisms, it is nowhere proposed as a term of communion. But the full account of this is, that it is an expression of Bellarmine, who carries the Pope's infallibility so high, that he says it is impossible for the Pope so to err as to declare virtue to be wicked, and vice to be good. And to prove this, *ab inconvenienti*, he thus argues :

¹ Launoïus, *Epistolæ*, Pars ii. Ep. ad Barillon ; Ep. ad Chr. Fauv. [Launoi (1603-1678) was a famous doctor of the Sorbonne, and a prolific theological and controversial writer on the Gallican side. His *Epistolæ* were published at Paris in eight volumes.]

If this infallibility be not granted in the Pope, then it would be attended with this fatal consequence, that if he should declare virtue to be bad, and vice to be good, all would be bound to believe it; having first supposed it impossible he should ever make such a declaration.¹ In the same manner as if any one, to prove that the Scripture cannot err in commanding vice or forbidding virtue, should say, we be bound to believe virtue to be evil, and vice to be good, because we are bound to believe that to be evil which the Scripture forbids, and that good which it commands. In which manner of arguing, *ab inconvenienti*, there is no absurdity, it having been before established as a certain truth, that it is impossible it should so err. Here is the history of this point; and it being here evident that the present question, as to the affirmative, is not so much as a common opinion among the writers of the Roman Communion, but only a way of arguing made use of by one author, at the same time supposing it impossible, it seems but just that this controversy should be laid by, according to our first rule, and not made an obstruction to a common union, since within the communion of the Roman Church, as well as out of it, there is the same liberty of maintaining this proposition, as a certain truth, that if in fact the Pope should at any time declare virtue to be wicked, and vice to be good, all are strictly bound in conscience not to believe him nor adhere to him in such a declaration. Thus I find this difficulty expounded by one of their own writers.

¹ *De Rom. Pont.* iv. 5.

QUEST. III. Whether the Pope be such an universal infallible guide, that the whole Church depends in an arbitrary manner upon his orders and decisions, so as to be paramount and superior to General Councils ?

So high as this Bellarmine seems to carry the Papal supremacy, and there is no being in communion with him but on these terms. But as to the Roman Church, which is the subject of my inquiry, there is no assent required to any such doctrine. There is no such doctrine declared either in the Council of Florence or Trent ; it is not contained in the profession of faith, which is offered to all beneficed persons as a test of their being orthodox in the belief of that Church. It is not in their public Catechism, composed for instructing the people in the faith of their Church. The assent to such doctrine is neither imposed or demanded of any that are admitted into that communion. And this seems enough to conclude it be no matter of *faith*, but only *opinion*, in which every one is left with the liberty of judging for himself, and consequently, according to our first rule, this question ought not to be insisted on. But, however, to give some farther evidence of its being no more than an opinion, I will add, that I find the Council of Pisa, held by many as general, showed itself in fact not to be of Bellarmine's judgment, whilst it first deposed Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. and afterwards elected Alexander V. into their place, which Council was by the same Alexander twice confirmed. Secondly, that the Councils of Constance and Basil have expressly in terms declared the supreme power of the Church militant, under Christ,

over all the faithful, even over the Pope himself, to be in General Councils, as to defining matters of faith, abolishing schisms, and reforming the Church, both in the head and members, and that all persons whatever, and amongst others the very Pope himself, is bound to obey, and be subject to their decrees.¹ Thirdly, that it has been a practice to appeal from the Bulls of divers Popes to a future General Council. The University of Paris has thus appealed four several times. The Emperor Charles v. made a like appeal; and several others are recorded by Richerius.² Fourthly, that Launoius has alleged the testimonies of thirty-five Popes for the superiority of Councils over the Pope.³ Fifthly, that in the decree of the Council of Florence the exercise of the Papal power, whatever it be, is limited, and tied to the observation of Œcumenical Councils, and the sacred canons, and consequently subjected to them; *quemadmodum et in gestis Œcumenicorum Conciliorum, et in sacris canonibus continetur*; which are the words of the said decree. Upon

¹ [The famous decrees passed in the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance, subsequently confirmed by Martin v., and renewed, with the sanction of Eugenius iv., in the second and third sessions of the Council of Basle, affirm that "a lawfully convoked Œcumenical Council, representing the Catholic Church Militant, derives its authority immediately from Christ, and every one, of whatever station and dignity, including the Papal, is bound to obey it in matters of faith, the healing of schism, and the general reformation of the Church of God in its head and its members." See Labbé's *Concilia*, tom. xii. pp. 19, 478, 480, and Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. vii. pp. 99, 101, 473.]

² *Hist. Conc. Constant.* p. 259. [Richer (1560-1631) was a famous syndic of the University of Paris, and wrote many works in defence of Gallicanism, but there is not any with the above title among them. The reference must be to his *Hist. of General Councils* or to his *Apology for Gerson*. See for account of him Jervis's *Gallican Church*, vol. i. pp. 265 *sqq.*]

³ *Epist.* Pars i. Ep. ad Sambævium.

all which it seems plain that the arbitrary power of the Pope, in his decisions and government of the Church, is not a matter of faith in that Church ; but that as it is maintained by Bellarmine, so the contrary is as positively asserted by others of his Church, and, consequently, that it is only a polemical question, in which every one has the liberty of judging for himself, and therefore, by our first rule, not to be made an obstruction to communion. And were the negative part so temerarious and false as Bellarmine censures it, yet since he is censured as severely by others for this his censure,¹ since neither side is anywhere imposed by that Church, still, according to our second rule, this question ought not to be insisted on ; because whichever side is in an error, yet the communion of the Church is so open, that it may be joined with, without professing or giving any assent to such error.

QUEST. IV. Whether the Pope has a power over temporals, so as to depose princes, and to absolve their subjects from their allegiance ?

So Bellarmine asserts, and, under these terms, there is no communicating with him. But as to his Church, the terms of communion are very different, for that does not require assent to any such doctrine. It is not in the profession of faith ; it has no place in the Catechism *ad Parochos*, nor other common Catechisms composed for instructing all in the faith of that

¹ Veron, *Reg. Fid.* ii. 15. [Veron (1575-1649) wrote several controversial works. His *Règle Générale de la Foi Catholique* was translated into Latin by the Jesuits of Ingoldstadt.]

Church ; it is not imposed on any in that communion, and therefore, according to our second rule, though never so erroneous, is not enough to hinder communion.¹

The proof of all this,—viz. that the deposing doctrine is no part of the faith of that Church, nor imposed on any,—seems very evident from the great numbers, not only of single writers, but likewise of Universities in that communion, which allow not of this deposing power, but strongly oppose it as a doctrine new and erroneous. Thus it is opposed by the whole Gallican Church, and was expressly condemned by eight Universities in France, an. 1626, declaring Santarellus's opinion of the Pope's deposing power as false, erroneous, contrary to the Word of God, pernicious, seditious, and detestable. To this add, that the treatise of Mariana, *De Rege et Regis Institutione*, which speaks too favourably of the deposing power, had been long before censured and burned by the secular authority at Paris, and disallowed by decree of the College of Sorbonne. And as for single writers that join in opposing the deposing power, a large list of them may be seen collected by a reverend and most learned bishop of our own Church, where he sets down a great number of canonists, divines, historians, etc., all concurring in the same sentiments, and afterwards con-

¹ ["Nor has this spiritual supremacy any relation to the wider sway once held by the pontiffs over the destinies of Europe. That the headship of the Church was naturally the highest weight and authority in a social and political state grounded on Catholic principles we cannot wonder. That power arose and disappeared with the institutions which produced or supported it, and forms no part of the doctrine held by the Church."—Wiseman's *Lectures on the Catholic Church*, vol. i. p. 264.]

cludes in these words: "If we add those numberless numbers of bishops, priests, monks, clerks, people, who, notwithstanding all the excommunications, bulls, depositions, privations, curses, interdictions of Popes, remained constant, even to blood and death, in their allegiance to their deposed princes; *quam pauci immo quam nulli sunt illi septuaginta Bellarminiani auctores, si cum illis Catholicissimis et constantissimis fidelibus conferantur*; how few, or rather, how none, will these seventy Bellarminian witnesses appear to be when compared with those most Catholic and constant believers, even bishops, who both before and after this controversy began, detested that power or rather tyranny?"¹ Out of which, without looking farther, it must be confessed that as Bellarmine, with many others, asserts the deposing power, so there are far more in the same communion who positively disown and even condemn it, without being cast out of the said communion for holding such doctrine contrary to the Pope's interest; and consequently, that the deposing power being no more than an opinion of some in that Church, and no matter of faith, there ought to be no breach of communion upon this account, according to our first rule, it being as free for those in that communion to deny the deposing power as for those that are out of it.

QUEST. V. Whether the deposing doctrine being asserted in Gratian's decrees and the canon law does

¹ Joannes Roffensis [Buckeridge], *De Potest. Pap. Temp.*, L. ii. cap. i. [John Buckeridge was Bishop of Rochester from 1612 to 1628, when he was translated to Ely.]

not make it an article of faith, or oblige all of that communion to assent to it?

I find Gratian's decrees to be the work of a private author, who can claim nothing of faith, as Veron's *Rule of Faith* in terms declares it, having likewise many mistakes, as the same Veron asserts, and which is further manifested by Antonius Augustinus, Archbishop of Arragon, in his dialogues *De Emendatione Gratiani*, so that the certainty of faith cannot be built on such a foundation.¹ The same is the fate of the whole canon law, in which Bellarmine himself acknowledges several errors.² And Canus, though a great asserter of the canon law, does not only confess that the being of any position in the canon law does not conclude it to be a doctrine of faith, but likewise acknowledges that several decretals therein contained have been by other succeeding Popes, and upon better advice, repealed, and the quite contrary established.³ If then all such decretals as are in the canon law are not proposed nor esteemed as of faith, nor imposed on any in that communion, the contents of them, according to our first and second rules, are not to obstruct a common union.

QUEST. VI. Whether the practice of this doctrine in

¹ Veron, *Reg. Fid.* i. 4. [For some account of Gratian's *Decretum*, published at Bologna in the twelfth century, and comprising the Isidorian decretals and various other spurious documents, see *Janus*, pp. 142 *sqq.*, Eng. Tr.]

² *De Rom. Pont.* iv. 12.

³ [Melchior] Canus, *De Loc. Theol.* v. 5 *ad fin.* [Melchior Canus, Bishop of the Canaries and Provincial of the Dominicans in Spain, died at Toledo in 1560. He wrote a work, *De Locis Theologicis*, in twelve books. In the passage here referred to occurs the famous saying, "Non eget Petrus mendacio nostro, nostra adulatione non eget."]

several Popes, who have deposed emperors and kings, does not prove it to be a doctrine necessarily to be believed by all in that communion?

There is no rule in that Church which obliges the members even to approve, much less believe, all that is practised by their Popes. Bellarmine himself, who would make the Pope infallible *in cathedra*, does not pretend to exempt him from error in *fact*; and as for all the others of that communion, whom we have reckoned above, dissenting from Bellarmine, these unanimously declare the Pope to be fallible in all other cases except when joined with the whole Church, and that too with relation to *credenda* only, and not to matters of fact or matters of discipline, or in framing laws not necessary to salvation. For in these, they say, both Pope and General Councils may err, and that no national Church is obliged to receive what is decreed by such Councils, except only as to *credenda*, but not as to laws and discipline. And this is in fact the practice of that Church. Hence it must be owned that what is decreed or practised by the Pope, separate from such a General Council, is of a much inferior rank, in whatever concerns discipline and practice, and consequently that there are none obliged to receive or approve such his practices now mentioned. And therefore there is found no obligation upon those in the Pope's communion of approving or assenting to all His Holiness does: it is not so much as required of bishops in that formula of obedience which they take at their consecration, neither has it place in any profession of faith. But, on the contrary, all in that communion

are at liberty of dissenting from such usurpations of the Pope. And accordingly I find the subjects of deposed princes continuing faithful in their allegiance to them after such sentence of deposition pronounced against them, and this both of bishops, priests, monks, clergy, and laity, even to the loss of their lives, in asserting the rights of their prince, notwithstanding all the interdicts of the Popes to the contrary, as has been now evidenced from the testimony of our own learned *Roffensis*,¹ and can be from *Canon Remonstr. Hibern.* (Part ii. c. 6, 7), where likewise may be seen a list of several Councils of German, French, and Italian bishops condemning the deposing doctrine, and even the author of it, Gregory VII.² Upon which there can be no surprise in what a learned modern (who has made sufficient inquiry into all these matters) declares, "that the deposing doctrine is rather taught by the Court than Church of Rome."³ Whence it must be owned, whilst in that communion there appears so strong an opposition against the deposing doctrine, and even against all the practice of such Popes as have acted by it, that neither the doctrine nor practice are matters of *faith* in that communion, nor *imposed* on any, and consequently, however erroneous the doctrine or corrupt the practice be, yet still, according to our second rule, this ought not to be made a cause of

¹ *De Potest. Pap.*, L. i. c. 8.

² [I have not been able to discover to what document the author is referring; apparently some protest of the Irish Catholic Bishops against the action of the Court of Rome.]

³ *Regal.*, ed. 1, p. 163. [See Leslie, *Case of Regale and Pontificat stated; Works*, ed. 1832, vol. iii. p. 402; cf. p. 457.]

separation, since there may be communion with that Church without professing such errors or partaking in such sinful practices.

QUEST. VII. Whether the deposing of Frederic II., Emperor, by Innocent IV. in the first Council of Lyons, or the third canon of the [fourth] great Council of Lateran, in favour of the deposing power, be proof of the necessity of this seditious doctrine being abetted by all in communion with that Church?

The great numbers of both clergy and laity in that communion disapproving, and even in terms condemning, the deposing power, is argument enough that they do not believe themselves obliged by anything that passed in the aforesaid Councils of Lyons or Lateran to approve that doctrine, so pernicious to all princes. The reasons they give of not being so obliged are these: First, as to the deposition of Frederic II.: that that act of deposition was only a *judicial sentence*, in a *particular case* involving many particular matters of fact, of *one* particular person. And that, as it is not the doctrine of their Church to hold even a General Council to be infallible in any such mere *judicial sentence*, so their Church does nowhere oblige them even to approve such a sentence, much less to take it for a canon or *rule of their faith*; and consequently that in their communion they are as much at liberty of disapproving what there passed as those are out of it. However, therefore, this doctrine be erroneous, yet since being in that communion does not oblige to the professing such an error, as it is evident by matter of fact; hence, according to our

second rule, this question as to the Council of Lyons may be laid by and occasion no difference between us, it being above dispute that we ourselves cannot more zealously condemn this opinion than the Gallican Church does, who, besides the doctrine, have utterly exploded the whole volume of the canon law called *Sextus Decretalium*, when Boniface VIII. had inserted that fatal sentence against Frederic. And so, as to the third canon of Lateran, they do not think themselves obliged to believe or even approve the deposing doctrine upon anything that is there delivered; and here I set down the reasons they give for this. First, because those Lateran canons are suspected as spurious, as it is owned by our famous *Roffensis*,¹ and by Archbishop Bramhall in his *Schism Guarded*.² Secondly, there is not a word in that canon against prince or king, or any supreme lord whatever, but only feudatories. Thirdly, the Fathers, in ordering the Pope to depose feudatories, acted on the authority of the supreme temporal lords of the see, who were present by their ambassadors, and were consenting to it, for raising money to carry on the holy war and for keeping peace in their absence in the Holy Land. Lastly, it is only a canon of discipline, in which *faith* is not concerned, which no nation is obliged to receive, and consequently which lays no obligation upon conscience to assent to it. It is not my business to examine into these reasons, but matter of fact is proof enough that they believe themselves no ways

¹ *De Potest. Pap.*, L. i. c. 6.

² [*Schism Guarded*, ch. vi. 2. (*Works*, vol. ii. p. 431, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*)]

obliged in conscience by that canon, since in Germany and France they have acted contrary to the deposing sense of it. Whatever, therefore, their reasons be, it is enough for our present purpose that both clergy and laity, abiding in that communion, condemn the deposing doctrine with all the bad practices; and therefore, since the being of that communion does not oblige any to partake in such errors or corrupt practices, according to our second rule, such errors and practices ought not to be made the occasion of disunion.

QUEST. VIII. Whether a nation that owns the Pope's authority can be free from slavery?

I set down the judgment of others relating to this subject; and, first, I find an eminent prelate of our own Church, Archbishop Bramhall, relating the fundamental laws of France and the liberties of the Gallican Church; and as to the civil government, these are some of them:—

1. The Pope cannot command or ordain anything, directly or indirectly, concerning any temporal affairs within the dominions of the King of France.

2. No command whatsoever of the Pope can free the French clergy from their obligation to obey the commands of their Sovereign.

3. The commissions and bulls of the Pope's Legates are to be seen, examined, and approved by the Court of Parliament, and to be registered and published with such cautions and modifications as that Court shall judge expedient for the good of the kingdom; and to be executed according to the said cautions, and not otherwise.

4. The prelates of the French Church (although commanded by the Pope), for what cause soever it be, may not depart out of the kingdom without the King's command or licence.

5. The Pope can neither by himself nor by his delegates judge of anything which concerns the state, pre-eminence, or privilege of the Crown of France, nor of anything pertaining to it. Nor can there be any question or process about the state or pretension of the King but in his own courts.

6. Papal bulls, citations, sentences, excommunications, and the like, are not to be executed in France without the King's command or permission; and after permission, only by authority of the King, and not by the authority of the Pope, to shun confusion and mixture of jurisdiction.

7. Neither the King, nor his realm, nor his officers, can be excommunicated or interdicted by the Pope, nor his subjects absolved from their oath of allegiance.

8. The Pope cannot impose pensions in France upon any benefices having cure of souls; nor upon any others, but according to the canons, according to the express condition of the resignation or *ad redimendam vexationem*.

9. Ecclesiastical persons may be convented, judged, and sentenced before a secular judge, for the first grievous or enormous crime, or for lesser offences after a relapse, which renders them incorrigible in the eye of the law.

10. All the prelates of France are obliged to swear

fealty to the King, and to receive from him their investitures for their sees or manors.

He adds several others of the like nature, and by many instances shows in these very words, that the Kings of France, with peers, parliaments, ambassadors, schools, and universities, have all of them, in all ages, affronted and curbed the Roman Court, and reduced them to a right temper and constitution, as often as they deviated from the canons of the Fathers, and encroached on the liberties of the Gallican Church, whereby the Pope's jurisdiction in France came to be merely discretionary at the pleasure of the King. And notwithstanding this, the Kings of France are acknowledged by the Popes themselves to be the most Christian, the eldest sons of the Church, and protectors of the Roman See.¹

In the same chapter he gives as many instances of the German Emperors in maintaining the rights of the empire, notwithstanding all opposition made against them by the Pope, and sets down the protestation of the electoral college and other princes of the empire, mentioned in their letter sent to Pope Benedict XII., viz., that they would maintain, defend, and preserve inviolate the rights, honours, goods, liberties, and customs of the empire, and their own electoral right, belonging to them by law or custom, against all men, of what pre-eminence, dignity, or state soever, notwithstanding any perils, or mandates, or processes whatsoever.

¹ Bramhall, *Just Vindication of Church of England*, Disc. iii. ch. 8. [ii. 7; *Works*, vol. i. pp. 225 *sqq.*, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*]

He goes on, showing the same at large of the King of Spain, both as to Spain, Flanders, and Sicily, as likewise of the King of Portugal, and of the State of Venice, all maintaining the rights and liberties of their respective States with as much opposition to the Pope as to any other invader whatever. He inserts likewise of England, in the time of owning the Pope's authority, that the Pope's decrees never had the force of laws here without the confirmation of the King, witness the decrees of the Council of Lateran, as they are called; that the Kings of England suffered no appeals to Rome out of their kingdoms, no Roman Legates to enter into their dominions without their licence, and declared the Pope's bulls to be void. And having thus run through all nations, he thus concludes: "We have said enough to show that all Christian nations do challenge the right to themselves to be the last judges of their own liberties and privileges." And he thus gives his opinion in answer to this eighth question: "That all nations which own the Pope are judges of their own liberties, and have on all occasions asserted them with as much freedom against the Pope as against any other invader."

Hugo Grotius, who spared no pains in informing himself of all these matters in the difference of Churches, and therefore is fit to be heard as an evidence, gives likewise his opinion in a few words as to this point. "The authority," says he, "of the Roman Bishop would not have seemed so formidable to Dr. Hall that he should therefore cast off all hope of reconciliation, had he known how ready the remedies are in France and

Spain to restrain the Pope from invading the rights, either of the Kings or Bishops.”¹

QUEST. IX. Whether a national Church that owns the Pope can maintain its national rights and liberties, without being enslaved by Rome?

Here again we must hear the opinions, or at least the account given by the now mentioned Archbishop Bramhall and Grotius. The former, relating the immunities of the Gallican Church, amongst other articles sets down these: 1. That the spiritual authority and power of the Pope is not absolute in France, but limited and restrained by the canons and rules of the ancient Councils of the Church received in that kingdom. Where observe, first, that the Pope can do nothing in France as a sovereign spiritual prince, with his *non obstantes*, either against the canons or besides the canons. Secondly, that the canons are no canons in France, except they be received.

2. The most Christian King has had power at all times, according to the occurrence and exigency of affairs, to assemble, or cause to be assembled, synods provincial or national, and therein to treat, not only of such things as concern the conservation of the civil estate, but also of such things as concern ecclesiastical order and discipline in his own dominions, and therein to make rules, laws, ordinances, in his own name and in his own authority.

3. The Pope cannot send a legate *a latere* into

¹ *Judgment of Religion*, London, 1653. [Grotius published no work with this title, but it may have been prefixed to some posthumous translation. He died in 1645. There is a passage identical in substance with that cited above in the *Votum pro Pace*, ad art. xv.]

France, with power to reform, judge, collate, dispense, or do such other things accustomed to be specified in the authoritative bull of his legation, except it be upon the desire or with the approbation of the most Christian King. Neither can the said legate execute his charge until he has promised the King in writing, under his oath, upon his holy orders, not to make use of his legatine power, in the King's dominions, longer than it shall please the King; and that so soon as he shall be admonished of the King's pleasure to forbid it, he will give it over; and that whilst he does use it, it shall be exercised conformable to the King's will, without attempting anything to the prejudice of the decrees of General Councils, or the liberties and privileges of the Gallican Church and the Universities of France.

4. All bulls and missives which came from Rome to France are to be seen and visited, to try if there be nothing in them prejudicial in any manner to the estate and liberties of the Church of France, or to the royal authority.

5. The Courts of Parliament, in case of appeals "as from abuse," have right and power to declare null, void, and to revoke the Pope's bulls and excommunications, and to forbid the execution of them when they are found contrary to sacred decrees, the liberties of the French Church, or the prerogative royal.

6. General Councils are above the Pope, and may depose him and put another in his place, and take cognisance of appeals from the Pope.

7. All bishops have their power immediately from

Christ, not from the Pope, and are equally successors of St. Peter and the other apostles and vicars of Christ.

8. The Pope cannot exempt any church, monastery, or ecclesiastical body from the jurisdiction of their ordinary, nor erect bishoprics into archbishoprics, nor unite them, nor divide them, without the King's licence.

As to Germany, he gives a full relation of the Emperor's calling synods, of reforming innovations by such synods, of reforming the excesses of the Roman Court and other ecclesiastical innovations and abuses.

As to the King of Spain, he says, that by himself and delegates, whom he substitutes, he judges and punishes all ecclesiastical crimes, even in cardinals which inhabit Sicily; he suffers no appeals to Rome; he admits no nuncios from Rome; that Charles v., an. 1534, renewed an edict of his predecessors at Madrid, that bulls and missives sent from Rome should be visited, to see they contained nothing in them prejudicial to the Crown or Church of Spain, which was strictly observed within the Spanish dominions; that Alexander Castracan was disgraced and expelled out of Spain for publishing the Pope's bulls, and that the Papal censures were declared void; and that the Pope's delegates have been banished out of that kingdom for maintaining the privileges of the Roman Court. The like he relates of Flanders and Venice.

Then, as to England, he says, that the Kings of England in their great councils did make themselves

the last judges of the liberties, and grievances, and necessities of their people, even in cases ecclesiastical, not the Pope ; that the Pope could do nothing here either against the canons or besides the canons ; that the canons are no canons here except they be received ; and then adds, that this same privilege was anciently radicated in the fundamental laws of England.¹

Let Grotius, in a few words, conclude, who in the book cited above says, that the King of Great Britain enjoys no power concerning things and persons ecclesiastical which the King of Sicily hath not also.

Here then, as to these two last questions, though I do not say that according to our rules they are or may be laid aside, yet if we take the opinion of these two great men, who made it their business to examine into this whole matter, and have evidence of *fact* to confirm their opinion, it must be owned that all those nations which own the Pope are provided with sufficient power and means to maintain, defend, and secure all rights, liberties, and privileges both of Church and State ; and that however pretending Popes have taken the advantage of weak and yielding princes, yet that resolute princes have again recovered all such rights, and that no such nation need to suffer upon this account but those that will.

QUEST. X. Whether the Bishop of Rome, as prime Patriarch, has power over all Churches, or, as Patriarch of the West, has any right of power over all Western Churches ?

Having considered so many questions concerning

¹ Bramhall, *Just. Vindic.*, *ut supr.*

the Pope, there seems to be none which need to obstruct a Catholic communion, but only this. And this, according to the Articles of our Church, we cannot easily subscribe. Now this whole controversy being reduced to one single question, were it not to be wished that those in whom the authority of our Church is lodged would, upon the motive of a general peace and healing the wounds of divided Christendom, see if there be any possible accommodation to be found for this point?

It is certain there is none to be found for that universal and unlimited supremacy which some Popes have taken upon them. There is none to be found for those encroachments of the Roman Court and its flatterers, by which they have endeavoured to subject both princes and national Churches to their arbitrary power. There is none to be found for that universal episcopacy claimed by John, Patriarch of Constantinople, and condemned by Gregory the Great as contrary to the Gospel and a scandal to the universal Church. In this sense, to oppose the Pope and his supremacy must be the interest of all States and Churches; and there can be no closing with him herein, since we find not only the whole Gallican Church, but likewise many other nations and princes, both with arguments and arms, resolutely opposing this degree of unlimited supremacy, and notwithstanding all the Roman thunder of excommunication and interdicts [they] have stood their ground, and still been acknowledged to be in communion with that see. The question is, whether there be any other primacy, or

limited supremacy, in which for public peace we may concur, while we oppose that which is unlimited, with all the usurpations and encroachments of it.

We find that King James I. owned the Pope to be Patriarch of the West, and the Church of Rome to be our mother. Thus in a public speech to his Parliament, an. 1603,—“I acknowledge,” saith he, “the Church of Rome to be our Mother Church.” And in his *Premonition to all Christian Monarchs*: “Patriarchs, I know, were in the time of the primitive Church, and I likewise reverence that institution for order sake. And for myself (if that were yet the question), I would with all my heart give my consent that the Bishop of Rome should have the first seat; I being a Western King would go with the Patriarch of the West. And for his temporal principality over the signiory of Rome, I do not quarrel it neither; let him in God His name be *Primus Episcopus inter omnes Episcopos*, and *Princeps Episcoporum*: so it be no otherwise but as Peter was *Princeps Apostolorum*.” And with respect to this, we might consider what he had there said a little before about the oath of allegiance: “The Lower House of Parliament at the framing of this oath made it to contain, ‘That the Pope had no power to excommunicate me,’ which I caused them to reform, only making it to conclude, ‘That no excommunication of the Pope’s can warrant my subjects to practise against my person or state;’ denying the deposition of Kings to be in the Pope’s lawful power, as indeed I take any such temporal violence to be far without the limits of such a spiritual

power as excommunication is." The same in effect is in *The Due Way of composing the Difference on Foot, Preserving the Church, according to the opinion of Herbert Thorndike*.¹

Now then the great question is concerning the primacy over all Christendom. And here, since his Majesty was for having the Pope to be as much over all other bishops as St. Peter was over all the other apostles, let us see how high the Church of England has set this superiority of the chief Apostle in the Collect for his day : " O Almighty God, who by Thy Son Jesus Christ didst give to Thy Apostle Saint Peter many excellent gifts, and commandedst him earnestly to feed Thy flock ; make, we beseech Thee, all bishops and pastors diligently to preach thy holy Word," etc. Here St. Peter, among many excellent gifts, has his power founded upon those words, *Pasce agnos et oves*, as being then particularly commissioned to feed the whole flock of Christ. And it is in due proportion to this that all other bishops and pastors are to preach. So also in the Gospel for that day we have St. Peter's glorious profession, occasioned by our Blessed Saviour's question put to His Apostles, and a gracious return thereto : " He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am ? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona : for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And

¹ [Thorndike's *Works*, vol. v. pp. 29, 30, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.* His point is, that the Pope has a right to patriarchal but not to absolute jurisdiction over the West.]

I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," etc. Look then into the Collects and Gospels for the other Apostles, and see whether this honour is there given to St. Paul, or to St. James, or to any else, whom humorists and fanciful men have at any time set up to stand in competition with St. Peter.

Some learned writers we have who propose a Catholic communion between all Christian bishops of the world, by joining with the Bishop of Rome, but seem not willing to allow more to him than a precedence of order. Mr. Thorndike, before named, a learned man of our own Church, seems to plead for a pre-eminency of power, and not only a precedence of rank, having been acknowledged originally in the Church of Rome.¹ And *Spalatensis* [*De Dominis*] concurs herein.² And Grotius goes yet farther. It is well known how industrious he was in examining into the root of all our divisions, how zealous for composing them, and that he had a great advantage above thousands in proposing means for bringing things to the conclusion of a happy and general peace. This great man thus qualified, in his last work, written not long before his death, makes this positive declaration, that there can be no hopes of uniting Protestants, except they are first united with that Church, which is in communion with Rome; owning at the same time a kind

¹ *Epilog.* iii. 20.

² *De Rep. Eccles.*, L. iv. cap. 9, n. 1, 15, 16. [Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, conformed for a time to the Church of England, and was made Dean of Windsor by James I. For some account of his strange career see Jervis's *Gallican Church*, vol. i. pp. 287 sqq. His *De Rep. Eccles.* was published in London in two books successively in 1617 and 1623.]

of authoritative primacy in the Pope, which is the ground of that Church's being united, and is no occasion of the separation that has been made from it. I give his own words:—

*“Restitutionem Christianorum in unum idemque Corpus, semper optatam a Grotio, sciunt, qui eum norunt. Existimavit autem aliquando, incipi posse a Protestantium inter se conjunctione. Postea vidit, id plane fieri nequire; quia, præterquam quod Calvinistarum ingenia ferme omnium ab omni pace sunt alienissima, Protestantes nullo inter se communi ecclesiastico regimine sociantur: Quæ causæ sunt, cur facile partes in unum Protestantium Corpus colligi nequeant; immo et cur partes aliæ atque aliæ sint exsurrecturæ. Quare nunc plane ita sentit Grotius, et multi cum ipso, non posse Protestantes inter se jungi, nisi simul jungantur cum iis, qui Sedi Romanæ cohærent; sine qua nullum sperari potest in Ecclesia commune regimen. Ideo optat, ut ea divulsio, quæ evenit, et causæ divulsionis tollantur. Inter eas causas non est primatus Episcopi Romani secundum canones, fatente Melanchthone, qui eum primatum etiam necessarium putat ad retinendam unitatem.”*¹ Which in English is thus rendered: “As many as know Grotius, know this of him, that he has always desired that Christians should be again united into one and the same body. He was once of opinion that this might have been begun by uniting Protestants with one another; afterwards he saw this was impossible, not only because the disposition of the Calvinists is averse to peace, but for that Protestants have no common

¹ Rivet. *Apologet. Discuss.*, ad fin.

Church-government in which they are joined ; which are the reasons that the several divisions of the Protestants can never meet into one body, but still more and more divisions will be made. Wherefore Grotius is now absolutely of this judgment, and many others concur with him in the same sentiments : That Protestants cannot be united among themselves, except they are united together with those who are in communion with the See of Rome. Hence it is his wish that the separation which has been made, and the causes of separation, were taken away. Amongst these causes the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, according to the canons, is not to be reckoned ; as Melanchthon likewise confesses, who is of opinion, that the primacy is even necessary for preserving of unity." The same he had in part declared before in his first *Reply to Rivetus* :—" *Quæ vero est causa, cur qui opinionibus dissident inter Catholicos, maneat eodem corpore non rupta communione ; contra qui inter Protestantos dissident, idem facere nequeant, utcunque multa de dilectione paterna loquantur ? Hoc qui rectè expenderit, inveniet quanta sit vis primatus,*¹ [*cujus rectum usum, quem non fuit improbaturus Melanchthon, reperiet qui volet, ne nimium distrahatur, in Gregorii Magni Epistolis.*]" "What is the reason," says he, "that those among the Catholics, who differ in opinion, still remain in the same body, without breaking communion, and those among the Protestants who disagree cannot do so, however they speak much of brotherly love ? Whoever will consider this aright

¹ *Animadvers. in Animadv. Riveti, ad art. 7.*

will find how great is the effect of the primacy, [whose right use, which Melanchthon would not have disapproved, will be found in the Epistles of Gregory the Great.]”

This we have from Grotius, and it was, as you see, noted even in his legacy to divided Christendom; directing them how their many unhappy schisms are to be healed. In this he owns a primacy in the Bishop of Rome, and this not of order only, which is little more than honorary, ceremonial, and ineffectual; but such as unites, prevents schisms, is a *commune regimen*, a common government, is according to the canons, and has so much authority that unity cannot be preserved without it. He declares likewise that such a primacy, according to the canons, has been no cause of dividing Churches, and at the same time wishes that all Protestants would unite in the acknowledgment of such authoritative primacy; so that it is evident, according to the judgment of this great man, there is such a primacy which those of the Reformation may own, and without which no Catholic communion, no general peace of Christendom, can be expected. I might have cited also Melanchthon himself in these words: “*Quemadmodum sunt aliqui episcopi qui præsunt pluribus Ecclesiis,*” etc. “As certain bishops preside over many Churches, so the Bishop of Rome is president over all bishops. And this canonical polity no wise man, I think, does, or ought to disallow. For the monarchy of the Bishop of Rome is, in my judgment, profitable to this end, that consent of doctrine may be retained. Wherefore an agreement may easily be established in

this article of the Pope's supremacy, if other articles could be agreed upon."¹ Thus great men give their opinions in this matter, in which, without proposing anything, I wish God would inspire all concerned to inquire into this matter, and laying aside all prejudicial thoughts, resolve upon making use of all expedients of peace as far as justice and truth will give leave. For certainly, as it has been lately said by a lover of unity : "Whatever lawfully may be done, ought to be done, for the healing of any schism."

¹ Melancthon, *Cent. Epist. Theol.*, Ep. 74. [*Respons. ad Bellarmin.*, quoted by Grotius, *De Antichr.*, Op. Theol. p. 483.]

CHAPTER III.

Of the Invocation of Saints and Angels.

QUEST. I. Whether the Church of Rome teaches those of her communion to forsake Christ, and not to trust in Him as their only Mediator?

Upon a full inquiry made into this matter, I find those of the Church of Rome place their trust and confidence in God, and in the Mediatorship of Christ, hoping for no salvation but through the merits of His sacred Passion, in the same manner as we do in our Church. This may be seen in the ordinary books of devotion and instruction used by them, and particularly in those books which, having been writ by them, we have reprinted for the common use of all in our Church. Such are the *Following of Christ*, or *The Christian's Pattern*, by Thomas à Kempis; F. Parson's *Directory*, or *Resolutions*; *The Introduction to a Devout Life* [by St. Francis of Sales]; *Devotions after the Ancient Way of Offices*, with others, in which they teach all to put their whole trust in God through Christ. But this I found most fully delivered in Rodriguez, who declares that all the operations of grace in us are freely added to us by God, who, of objects of wrath, has made us His children, "not moved thereto by any former merits

of ours, or in consideration of future services, but by His own pure mercy, and the merits of our only Mediator Jesus Christ (these are his words), since according to the words of the Apostle, 'We are justified freely by the grace of God, and by the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.'"¹ And the same again in their *Catechismus ad Parochos*, in which the pastors of that Church are enjoined to instruct their flock in all that belongs to the mysteries of Christ's Passion, in the effects and benefits of it to mankind, which article is thus concluded: "I wish these mysteries were daily in our minds, that we may learn to suffer and die, and be buried together with our Lord; that so, all the filth of sin being cast off, we may rise again together with Him to a new life, and by His grace and mercy be at length made worthy to partake of His heavenly glory."² And in the explication of the Lord's Prayer, wherein the pastor is thus ordered to teach his flock: "That we are not only debtors to God, but also that we are not capable of discharging our debt; since a sinner of himself is not able to make any satisfaction. Wherefore we must flee to the mercy of God; and because His justice is equal to His mercy, therefore we must make use of the intercession and patronage of the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, without which none have ever obtained pardon of their sins."³ The same doctrine I find frequently delivered in the Council of Trent: "Those who are born of Adam, if they were not regenerated in Christ, could never be justified,

¹ Rodriguez, *On Christian Perfection*, Part xi. c. 33.

² *Cat. ad Paroch.*, Pars i. cap. 5, Q. 15 *ad fin.*

³ *Ibid.* Pars iv. cap. 14, Q. 12, 13.

since that grace by which they are justified is given them by the merit of His Passion, in whom we have redemption and remission of our sins.”¹ And again : “Believing in the first place, that by God the sinner is justified by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, and turning themselves to consider the mercy of God, they are raised up in hope, confiding that God, through Christ, will be propitious to them, and then begin to love Him as the Fountain of all righteousness.”² Again, in the first *Canon de Justific.* is this anathema pronounced : “If any one shall say that man is justified before God by his own works, done either by the impulse of nature or the instruction of the law, without the Divine grace, through Jesus Christ, let him be anathema.”³ Many other places have I read of this kind in their own books, so plain and full, that I dare affirm it upon my own knowledge, that in this point there is no difference between the two Churches, and that those in communion with the Roman Church place as firm a confidence in Christ, and in the merits of His Passion, confessing that nothing can be obtained but through Him, as those do of the Reformation. Segneri, the famous Italian Jesuit, may help to clear this point, who says that “if all the labours, tears, fasts, and prayers of all the Saints, with the Blessed Virgin, and the blood of all the Martyrs, were put together, they are not sufficient to satisfy for the least part of a mortal sin without the Blood and Passion of Christ.”⁴ The charge then of for-

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. vi. cap. 3.

² *Ibid.* cap. 6.

³ *Ibid.* can. i.

⁴ [Segneri (1624-1694) was eminent as a mission preacher, and the author of several devotional works. The quotation is from his *Il Penitente Istruito*.]

saking Christ, as for all I can discover, is a consequence of ours from their calling upon the Saints to pray for them, which many of our divines say they cannot do but by forsaking or wronging the mediatorship of Christ. But this being *a consequence which they expressly disown*, therefore, according to our fourth rule, it is what we ought never to charge upon them, and consequently it is a question which ought not to hinder communion. Now that they *expressly disown this consequence*, is evident in the Council of Trent, where, acknowledging in St. Paul's words, "One Mediator between God and men, Christ Jesus," they condemn all those who say that the invocation of Saints is injurious to the honour of this one Mediator, and expressly enjoin all pastors to teach their flock that it is good and profitable to ask the prayers of the Saints for obtaining blessings of God, through Jesus Christ His Son, our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour.¹

QUEST. II. Whether there be not many phrases and expressions in their ordinary prayer-books in which they seem to confide in the Saints and injure the Mediatorship of Christ?

The general and most authentic address to the Saints is only this, "Pray for us." And whatever other expressions are found in their books, since they mean no more, as they declare themselves, than to beg the prayers of the Saints, and declare their abhorrence of all that is injurious to the Mediatorship of Christ, hence the difficulty here comes to no more than about words and phrases. And since, according

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 25, De Invoc. *ad init.*

to our third rule, such quarrels ought not to be advanced, but laid by, by all lovers of peace, hence this question ought not to be made an exception against communion, especially too, since their Church obliges none to make use of such books wherein such expressions are ; and therefore being not imposed by the Church, according to our second rule, this question is not to obstruct a common peace.

QUEST. III. Whether those in communion with the See of Rome do not pray more to the Saints, but especially to the Virgin Mary, than to God ?

I have made a very particular inquiry into this matter, and find that throughout their whole Missal (which is their book of Divine service) and Breviary (which is their daily office, or devotion of their priests) there is not one collect or prayer to any one saint whatever, but every one is expressly directed to God, and all ending with the same conclusion as we have, "Through our Lord Jesus Christ, Thy Son." On all Sundays in the year their Collects are generally the very same with ours ; on St. Michael's day the Collect is the same, and on the Saints' days the Collects are ever addressed to God, and only begging that by the prayers and intercessions of the Saints may be granted what they ask, but still concluding their whole petition with their confidence in Jesus Christ, "Through our Lord Jesus Christ." So that in the solemn worship of the Church, at which all are obliged to be present, it cannot be observed that they directly desire the prayer of any Saints, except only in the *Confiteor*, which is very short, and in the Litanies,

which are said only twice in the whole year ; and even then the people are not obliged to be present at them.

Besides these books of solemn or public worship they have a private devotion of the Rosary, in which there are ten Hail Marys for one Lord's Prayer. This is indeed approved, but nowhere commanded by the Church, nor is it imposed on any ever to say it throughout their whole lives. And even in the direction for such as think fit to say it, I find particular instructions given for performing that devotion in memory of Christ's Incarnation, and of the principal mysteries of His death and passion. But this I undertake not here to justify ; it is enough to answer my purpose that it is not imposed on any by that Church ; but those who are of that communion are equally at liberty of never using it with others that are out of it. Hence, according to our second rule, though it were a corrupt practice, yet it ought not to obstruct communion.

QUEST. IV. Whether there be not great abuses in the Church of Rome, in relation to the Saints, by drawing the people from their due dependence on Christ, and by confiding so much in their intercession as to neglect the ways of repentance upon presumption of their prevailing prayers ?

It is very likely there are many abuses of this kind ; but since these abuses are nowhere imposed on the members of that Church ; since they are not approved by her ; nay, since she has expressly recommended to the prelates to be watchful in taking away all super-

stitution in the invocation of Saints, and other abuses in keeping of their holy-days;¹ since the Catechisms, and other books published by authority, mention these very abuses, and condemn them with as much severity as any of our Church can possibly do—as may be seen in the Spiritual Director, translated from the French (ch. xxiv.); and in the Catechism of the Four French Bishops (Part vi. Art. 2, Less. 8), in which are set down the abuses to be avoided in the invocation of Saints, and in the devotion to the Virgin Mary—since, I say, the abuses, whatever they may be of this kind, are disapproved by the authority of that Church and her several pastors, these, according to our second rule, ought not to be made an objection against communion.

QUEST. V. Whether it be lawful to desire the Saints in heaven to pray for us?

In this whole matter of the invocation of Saints, this is the only single point which wants to be accommodated between the two Churches. For this is the only thing the Church in communion with Rome has declared in the Council of Trent: *Bonum atque utile esse, Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes suppliciter invocare*,—"That it is good and profitable to call upon the Saints."

Now, that this doctrine should be condemned as it stands under all its abuses, superstitions, and incommodious explications, as Grotius terms them—as it is injurious to the mediation of Christ, and gives people a confidence of salvation, without due care for amend-

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 25, De Invoc.

ment of their sinful lives—that it should be thus condemned I do not wonder ; neither can it be expected or desired we should ever close with it, since it would be as easy to renounce all religion as to approve and subscribe what is not consistent with the mediation of Christ.

But whatever were or are the abuses of this practice in the Church of Rome, since they come so far towards us as to declare against all such abuses, and enjoin a reformation of them ; since they join with us in holding to the one Mediator Jesus Christ ; since they absolutely declare to their people that “it is absolutely necessary for them to place their whole confidence in Jesus Christ, because, as the Holy Scripture declares, there is no salvation by any other but through Him,” as it is taught in the Catechism of the Four Bishops now cited ; since they ask of the Saints in heaven to become petitioners together with them, as they desire the same of their brethren on earth, and with the same confidence in Jesus Christ, knowing that nothing can be obtained by the just in heaven or on earth but through the mediation of His Passion ; since, I say, this doctrine is proposed with this moderation and with these restraints, the question is, Whether under these terms there can be any hopes of accommodating it upon the consideration of a public peace ?

So far I have encouragement, that I find a learned and zealous prelate of our own Church not only favouring, but even approving it and pleading for it, viz.

Bishop Montague of Chichester, and afterwards of Norwich.

1. He owns that the Saints in heaven pray for the faithful on earth. "I do not deny," says he, "but the Saints are mediators, as they are called, of prayer and intercession, but in general, and for all in general. They interpose with God by their supplications, and mediate by their prayers."¹ I know many others join with him, and in this mediation expound that article of our creed, "Communion of Saints."

2. He owns that the blessed in heaven do recommend to God in their prayers their kindred, friends, and acquaintance on earth. And having given his reasons for this he inserts this declaration: "This is the common voice with general concurrence, without contradiction of reverend and learned antiquity, for ought I ever could read or understand; and I see no cause or reason to dissent from them touching intercession in this kind."²

3. He owns also that it is no injury to the mediation of Christ to ask of the Saints to pray for us. "Indeed I grant," says he, "Christ is not wronged in His mediation; it is no impiety to say as they (of the Roman Church) do, 'Holy Mary, pray for me;' 'Holy Peter, pray for me.'" And going on upon this subject of the blessed in heaven, in the next page he says: "Could I come at them, or certainly inform them of my state, without any question or more ado, I would

¹ Montague, *Antidiatrib.* pp. 19, 20 [ed. 1625].

² *Ibid.*, *Treatise on Invoc. of Saints*, p. 103 [ed. 1624].

readily and willingly say, ‘Holy Peter, Blessed Paul, pray for me; recommend my case unto Christ Jesus our Lord.’ Were they with me, by me, in my kenning, I would run with open arms, and γονυπετεῖν, fall upon my knees, and with affection desire them to pray for me.” And, “I see no absurdity in nature, no incongruity unto analogy of faith, no repugnancy at all to sacred Scripture, much less impiety, for any man to say, Holy angel guardian, pray for me.”¹

In these terms this prelate, writing professedly upon this subject, seems to approve this whole doctrine; and the only difficulty he makes in the practice is because he does not apprehend how the Saints shall come to the knowledge of the petitions made to them. But since the holy Scripture tells us that there is joy in heaven at the conversion of a sinner, which shows that Saints and Angels, though we cannot tell by what means, do certainly know it,—since I find St. Augustine moving the same difficulty, and confessing it above the reach of his judgment to know how the martyrs relieve those who call upon them, and yet owning at the same time that they do certainly assist them, and do intercede for such as call upon them,²—since this difficulty did not discourage the practice in his time of begging their prayers, nor render such practice useless, it may be hoped, notwithstanding the difficulty, there may be means found by those in authority for accommodating this point at present;

¹ Montague, *Treatise on Invoc. of Saints*, pp. 118, 119, 97.

² *De Cura Mort.* c. 26.

and that while so eminent a prelate of our own Church went so far, and justified what he had writ against all opposers, it may be a motive for removing present objections, that so this point may not be an obstruction to that general peace which is so much desired.

CHAPTER IV.

Of Images.

QUEST. I. Whether the Church of Rome teaches those in her communion to pray to images?

I have fully examined into this point, and find there is no such thing taught by the Council of Trent, nor in their profession of faith, nor in their Catechisms published for the instruction of the people. On the contrary, the Council of Trent declares that "there is no divinity nor virtue in the images of Christ or the Virgin Mary, for which they are to be worshipped, and that nothing is to be asked of them, nor any confidence to be placed in them, as was formerly done by the heathens who trusted in their idols."¹ And in their Catechisms I see the question is asked, "Whether Catholics pray to images?" and 'tis positively answered, "No, they do not." And this reason is added, "Because they neither can see, nor hear, nor help us."² If then any can be supposed so stupid as at any time to have done it, yet since that Church is so far from teaching it that she teaches the contrary, therefore

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 25.

² *Cat. ad Par.*, Pars iii. cap. 2, Q. 16.

this question ought not to be pressed as any obstruction to the Catholic communion.

QUEST. II. Whether there be not some expressions in their hymns, and especially those relating to the Cross, which import as much as a prayer?

I have seen such expressions, though very few, which, being in hymns, seem to me no more than poetical liberties; such are usual in canticles, and are found in Scripture, as Deut. xxxii. 1, where Moses speaks to the heavens and to the earth. And while those in that communion positively declare they are no more than figurative expressions, and their Church declares that no images ought to be prayed to, it seems reasonable to expound their hymns by their professed doctrine, and not on the contrary, since no religion, nor book, nor even the Scripture, can stand the test of maintaining all that for professed doctrine, which can be inferred from its literal expressions, it being certain in many instances that the letter killeth. But if this be not reason enough for waiving this question, yet from our second rule it ought to be laid by, since that Church imposes not the saying those hymns on any of the flock, but they may be all their lives in that communion without ever once repeating them.

QUEST. III. Whether those in communion with the Roman Church are not idolaters in the worshipping of images?

I have strictly inquired into this point, and by all I can observe, both in their Councils, professions of faith, catechisms, spiritual books, and other books of devotion, I cannot see but they as firmly believe in

one only God as we do in the Church of England, and with as much constancy declare that the honour of God ought not to be given to another. The whole body of their devotions and Breviary is composed of David's Psalms, in which is the so frequent confession of one God, and confusion pronounced against all worshipping of idols. Hence they repeat every week the 97th Psalm, v. 7, in these words: *Confundantur omnes qui adorant sculptilia, et qui gloriantur in simulachris suis.* "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols." Every Sunday at evensong they repeat Psalm cxv., in which they profess one God, reproach idols for being the work of men's hands, for having eyes and seeing not, for having ears and hearing not, and then go on with this verse, *Similes illis fiant, qui faciunt ea, et omnes qui confidunt in eis*, which in their version is more than ours, even an imprecation or wish "that all men may become like them, who make them, and put their trust in them." From all which I must conclude that all the charge of idolatry is only a consequence of ours, and such as they expressly disown, I may say abhor, and therefore, according to our fourth rule, ought not to be insisted on as an obstruction to communion, especially since that Church imposes on none the use of any images, but leaves all its members at liberty of using them if they think fit, or of wholly letting them alone, which, according to our second rule, is motive enough for waiving this question, since whatever the idolatry be they oblige none to be guilty of it.

QUEST. IV. Whether those in the Roman Communion are not taught to honour and worship graven images?

I have with great application examined into this point, and the result of my inquiry is this: I find their Council of Trent declares (and 'tis the same in their profession of faith) that "due honour (or the honour which is due) and veneration is to be given to the images of Christ."¹ This is a very large expression, and cannot well be excepted against, while it approves no more than is *due*. And having considered their several explications of this honour, I find it comes to no more than this,—that is, such honour as is generally thought due to all holy things which have any eminent or particular relation to God, or to His worship and service, such as was due formerly to the ark of the Testament or to the temple; such as is now judged due to the name of Jesus, to the altar, to the books of the Gospels, to holy vessels, to the sacramental bread, to the Church, to the ministers of the altar. Such honour as this is what in the Roman Church is judged due to the images of Christ, which being proper for moving pious affections and raising devotion, are numbered amongst things consecrated to God's service.

As to the honour given to the name of Jesus, see Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, an. 1559, where 'tis enjoined, "That whensoever the name of Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherwise in the church

¹ [*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 25, De Invoc. The decree expressly lays down that the honour is relative, and not from any intrinsic virtue in the image.]

pronounced, due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowness of courtesy, and uncovering of heads of the mankind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed," reinforced by the canons under King James I., an. 1663. And surely, since this pronounced name is the same to the ear that the image is to the eye, whatever reverence is lawfully given to one may be as lawfully given to the other.

Archbishop Laud was for reverence not only before and towards but to the altar in his speech in the Star Chamber, the 14th of June 1637. And it may not be amiss to observe how he there addressed the Lords of the Garter. "I hope," saith he, "a poor priest may worship God with as lowly reverence as you do, since you are bound by your order and by your oath, according to a constitution of Henry the Fifth (as appears in *Libro Nigro Windesorensi*), to give due honour and reverence *Domino Deo, et altari Ejus, in modum virorum ecclesiasticorum*,—that is, to the Lord your God and to His altar (for there is a reverence due to that too, though such as comes far short of divine worship) and this in the manner as ecclesiastical persons both worship and do reverence" (p. 49). Now if this honour may be allowed to the very altar, why not to the images of Christ, and in proportion too to those of Saints?

I must confess the schoolmen, in explicating this honour, have by their subtilties raised several questions such as perplex instead of clearing the point; as, whether this honour be a religious honour?

whether it be properly adoration or worship? whether it be the same that is given to the things represented, or inferior to it? with other like. And these several opinions have furnished matter for very plausible objections. But when all is considered, the case appears very evident, that all such difficulties and objections so moved are only disputes about terms and words, having equal force with relation to all the other holy things now mentioned as to the images of Christ; and therefore I think, without wronging the cause of either side, they may be all laid by, according to our third rule, and not to be made any longer an objection against a general peace. And for this I have the famous Grotius to strengthen my sentiments, who, speaking of the use of images, concludes thus: "Truly, if in this disquisition ambiguous words (which by their various acceptation distract the minds of men) were set aside (namely invocation, adoration, worship, religion, honour); and if in things themselves the indifferent were distinguished from the unlawful, there would be fewer seeds of contention."¹

QUEST. V. Whether there have not been and are great abuses in relation to images in the Church of Rome, at least amongst the more ignorant, who seem to place a confidence in them, and believe a thousand ridiculous miracles of them, by which the images become injurious to God?

Grotius was of opinion, that in the use of images the mean has been exceeded by many. And the Council of Trent seems to suppose many abuses and

¹ See *Vot. pro Pace Eccles.*, ad art. xx.

superstitions to have crept in amongst the people, which ought to be reformed. But however, since such abuses and superstitious practices are so far from being approved that they are condemned by the said Council, and order is given to the prelates of removing all such abuses, and tolerating no sort of images which can be the occasion of error to the people, and of admitting no sort of miracles to be published but what, upon due examination, they shall approve,¹—hence, by our second rule, this question ought to be cast by, since any one may communicate with that Church without partaking in such sinful practices.

QUEST. VI. Whether it be not a superstitious practice still kept up to this day in worshipping the Cross on Good Friday, and kissing it on the knees?

It certainly looks so. But since they positively declare that by this outward action they intend no more but to express that love and veneration which is due to the Cross, as to other holy things, and to their Redeemer, who on that day died for them; in this sense it comes to be no more than if one should with bended knees in the same manner kiss the book of the Gospel, in acknowledgment and thanksgiving of Christ preaching the Gospel of Salvation. It is no more than if we should not only bow our body to the holy altar, but fall flat on our faces before His footstool, so soon as ever we come in sight thereof; “for in this case,” says Dr. Pocklington, “what apostle or father would condemn us for it, and not rather be delighted to see

¹ *Conc. Trid., ut supra.*

the Lord so honoured?" (*Sun. no Sab.*) 'Tis no more than if being upon Mount Calvary, on Good Friday, we should prostrate ourselves, and on our knees kiss the ground where the cross stood. A grateful acknowledgment of faith and love is due to our Redeemer, in a most special manner, on that day of our redemption; and if, instead of Mount Calvary, we should humble ourselves to the ground and kiss the Cross, so to express this our acknowledgment of love to Christ, I cannot but hope it might be done without being idolatry, however it might look to others, who through ignorance might take exceptions at it.¹ These are the explications given by the Romanists of this Good Friday ceremony. But I am not concerned in justifying their reasons; 'tis enough for my present purpose that the performing this ceremony is not enjoined by that Church on the people; and therefore, if the practice be not warrantable, yet since it is not imposed, according to our second rule this ought not to obstruct communion.

QUEST. VII. Whether it be not a sinful practice to paint the Trinity, and represent God the Father as an old man; since this must be an occasion of notorious error to the ignorant, in making them believe that God is corporeal, and has the likeness of His creatures?

The Church of Rome believes and teaches the same as we do as to God: that He is infinite, incorporeal, a pure Spirit, and that it is not possible to represent Him as He is, under any figure, to human eyes. But

¹ [It is difficult to believe that this beautiful and touching ceremony could offend any devout Christian who had witnessed it; still more that he could regard it as idolatrous.]

as the whole Christian world represents the Holy Ghost (though equally a pure Spirit with the Father) in the form of a dove, because in that form He has shown Himself visible to men, so those of the Roman Church sometimes represent God the Father under the form of an old man, because in this form He was seen by Daniel in his vision, where he saw "the Ancient of Days sitting on the throne, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of His head like the pure wool."¹ And for preventing any errors being occasioned in the ignorant by such pictures, the Council of Trent gives express orders to the pastors to teach the people that they are not to imagine the Divinity can be expressed in colours or any created similitude, for that it is wholly invisible to corporeal eyes. And therefore, whatever this practice be, whether warrantable or no, yet since that Church is so far from proposing it, as injurious to the Divinity of God, that it is solicitous to prevent all such errors, hence, according to our second rule, this question may be laid by, and not be made an occasion of obstructing communion.

QUEST. VIII. Whether there be anything in this point of the images of Christ and His Saints which may not be reconciled between the two Churches?

Whatever superstitious practices or abuses there are amongst the ignorant or others in this point cannot be approved; but since the Church of Rome approves them not, earnestly desires their reformation, as it is in the Council of Trent: "*Eas prorsus aboleri*

¹ Daniel vii. 9.

sancta synodus vehementer cupit."¹ In this the two Churches are agreed, and there is no need of quitting the one and going to the other for disapproving and condemning all such abuses and superstitious practices.

But as to the doctrinal point, as it is delivered by the moderate ones of the Church of Rome, and is sufficient for communion, though our Church has never in terms assented to it, yet I find eminent pastors of it allowing it so far as even the other side requires, and this may be a great step towards the accommodation of it.

1. The historical use of pictures is allowed by all.

2. A religious use of them is allowed by some, as they help to raise our affections and move our devotion. Bishop Montague, speaking of holy images, declares his thoughts in these words: "Nor are they utterly and absolutely unlawful for any religious employment. Our strictest writers do not condemn or censure St. Gregory for putting upon them that historical use of suggesting unto, moving, or affecting the mind, even in pious and religious affections. For instance, in remembering more feelingly, and so being impassioned more effectually with the death, bloodshed, and bitter Passion of our Saviour, when we see that history fully and lively represented unto us in colours, or worked by a skilful hand."² And Dr. Pocklington joins in this with the Bishop.

3. A respect and honour is allowed them by the same prelate. "The pictures of Christ, the blessed Virgin, and Saints, may be made, had in houses, set

¹ *Conc. Trid., ut supra.*

² Montague, *Appeal*, ch. xxi. pp. 253, 254.

up in churches; the Protestants use them; they despight them not. Respect and honour may be given unto them; the Protestants do it, and use them for helps of piety, in rememoration, and more effectual representation of the prototype.”¹ In the contents he says that “images may affect the minds of religious men, by representing unto them the actions of Christ and His Saints, in which regard,” says he, “all reverence simply cannot be abstracted from them.”²

Now if this honour can be allowed to be such as is given to holy things, as holy vessels, churches, the book of the Gospel, etc., there’s no need of more for this point’s being accommodated, since this is enough for communicating with the Roman Church, with a liberty likewise of terming it religious or not religious, as every one shall think best, there being no restraint as to these terms.

¹ *Gagger*, p. 318.

² *Appeal*, p. 252.

CHAPTER V.

Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Real Presence, Transubstantiation.

QUEST. I. Whether the Romanists are not idolaters in worshipping the bread and wine ?

If they worship the bread and wine as God, and thus require it to be done by all in communion with them, this would certainly be a just motive for not communicating with them or their Church. But upon examination, I find their declaration to be unanimous in this point ; that however they are taught to worship the sacrament, yet this only is understood of *res sacramenti*, that is, the adoration of Christ in the sacrament. According to what is defined in the Council of Trent, "*Si quis dixerit in sancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latriæ etiam externo adorandum, anathema sit.*"¹ Christ then being solemnly professed by them to be the object of their worship in the Eucharist, and not the elements of bread and wine, our charge of idolatry upon them seems no more than a consequence of ours from our principles, and not theirs, and such as they disown, I may say detest, and therefore, according to our fourth

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xiii. can. 6.

rule, ought not to be made the occasion of a separate communion.

QUEST. II. Whether there be not so many absurdities and contradictions, both to sense and reason, in the doctrine of the Real Presence, as taught by the Romanists, that it is impossible to be reconciled?

So it certainly seems to many; and yet I do not find, in the judgment of the Reformation, that the belief of the Real Presence is sufficient cause for separating communion. The Lutherans believe a real presence, and yet are Protestants; and notwithstanding this their belief, the Calvinists in France, in a national synod, an. 1631, declared their union with the Lutherans, and admitted them to communion. And by what I observe, even Calvin and other great men of the Reformation seem to assert the same doctrine with the Church of Rome, as to the real presence. Calvin, upon 1 Cor. xi. 24, "Take, eat, this is My Body," says thus: "*Neque enim mortis tantum, et resurrectionis Sux beneficium offert Christus, sed Corpus ipsum, in quo passus est, et resurrexit.*" "Neither does Christ offer us the benefit only of His death and resurrection, but that very Body itself, in which He suffered, and rose again." Beza, with others, as related by Hospinian, "*Fatemur in cæna Domini, non modo omnia Christi beneficia, sed ipsam etiam Filiij hominis substantiam, ipsam, inquam, veram carnem, et verum illum sanguinem, quem fudit pro nobis, non significari duntaxat, aut symbolice, typice, vel figurate proponi, tanquam absentis memoriam; sed vere ac certo repræsentari, exhiberi, et applicanda offerri, adjunctis*

symbolis minime nudis, sed quæ (quod ad Deum ipsum promittentem et offerentem attinet) semper rem ipsam vere ac certo conjunctam habeant, sive fidelibus, sive infidelibus proponantur. Ut appareat nos ipsius corporis et sanguinis Christi præsentiam in cæna retinere, et defendere."¹ Here, they say, the presence is not figurative, or typical, but that the very thing itself is joined with the symbols.

Likewise, I find the doctrine of the Real Presence in terms asserted by our own Church, and the eminent members thereof. Thus what can be more positive and clear than those words in the Catechism, where to the question, "What is the inward part or thing signified?" it is answered, "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Here the faithful are the communicants, and they do here participate of the very Body and Blood; even in distinction to the fruits thereof, which are the subject of the next question: "What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?" So also in delivering the Sacrament in the Communion Office, it is said, "The Body of our Lord," etc., and "The Blood of our Lord," etc. Nor ought the additional, "Take," etc., to be now thought any abatement of the verity of the thing, unless we condemn the leaving it out in the new Liturgy made for the Church of Scotland, and authorised by his Majesty, anno 1636.

¹ Hospinian, *Hist. Sacr.*, Pars ii. p. 251. [Hospinian (1547-1626) was a Swiss Protestant, and author of several theological works, of which the *Historia Sacramentaria*, in two vols., is one.]

Queen Elizabeth was so fixed upon the Real Presence, that she suffered not her faith to be shocked therein. She determined the case in these following verses :—

“ ’Twas God the Word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it,
And what the Word did make it,
That I believe and take it.”

And in her reign Mr. Hooker said that the different opinions of the Sacrament thus far accord in one, that these holy mysteries, received in due manner, do instrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that Body and Blood, which were given for the life of the world ; and besides also impart unto us, even in a true, and real, though mystical manner, the very Person of our Lord Himself, whole, perfect, and entire.¹

What King James I. and Bishop Andrewes believed in this point may be seen in the *Answer to Card. Bellarmine's Apology* : “ *De hoc est, fide firma tenemus, quod sit. Præsentiam, inquam, credimus, nec minus quam vos veram.*”² “We believe a true presence as much as you.” And we have the same in Casaubon's Letter, written also by the King's command to Card. Perron.

Bishop Montague's *Appeal* may be next seen, chapter xxx., the [table of] contents of which is thus :—“A Real Presence maintained by us. The difference betwixt us and Popish writers is only about the *modus*, the manner, of Christ's presence in the

¹ Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v. 67, 7.

² [Andrewes's *Resp. ad Bellarm.* cap. i. p. 11 (p. 13, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*)]

Blessed Sacrament. Agreement likely to be made, but for the factious and unquiet spirits on both sides. *Beati Pacifici.*" And in the body of the chapter he speaks thus to the informers, his adversaries: "The Real Presence in your divinity is flat Popery, but not in the divinity of the Church of England. Concerning this point I said, and I say so still, that if men were disposed as they ought, unto peace, there need be no difference. And I added a reason, which I repeat again here: The disagreement is only in *de modo presentia*; the thing is yielded to on either side, that there is in the holy Eucharist a real presence. 'God forbid,' saith Bishop Bilson, 'we should deny that the Flesh and Blood of Christ are truly present and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's table. It is the doctrine that we teach others, and comfort ourselves withal.' And the reverend and learned Answerer unto Bellarmine's *Apology* cometh home to the faith, or Popery if you will, condemned in M. Montague, who learnt it of him and such as he is. *Nobis vobiscum de objecto convenit, de modo lis est. Præsentiam, inquam, credimus, non minus quam vos, veram; de modo presentia nil temere definimus.* And to them agreeth Bishop Morton. 'The question is not concerning a real presence, which Protestants do also profess,—Fortunatus, a Protestant, holding that Christ is in the Sacrament most really; *verissime realissimeque* are his words.'"¹ In these words does Bishop Montague declare and defend his belief of the Real Presence.

Archbishop Laud, besides what was noted from him

¹ Montague's *Just Appeal*, ch. xxx. [pp. 288 *sqq.*, ed. 1625.]

before out of his speech in the Star Chamber, gives there also this reason drawn from the Real Presence, for reverence to the altar, as being upon this account the greatest place of God's residence upon earth. "I say," saith he, "the greatest, yea, greater than the pulpit. For there it is '*Hoc est Corpus Meum*,' 'This is My Body.' But in the pulpit it is at most but '*Hoc est verbum Meum*,' 'This is My word.' And a greater reverence (no doubt) is due to the Body than to the word of our Lord. And so in relation answerably to the throne, where His Body is usually present, than to the seat whence His word useth to be proclaimed" (p. 47). And elsewhere in his *Conference with Fisher* (sec. 35, n. 6, punct. 4) he quotes Bishop Ridley's confession set down by Foxe (p. 1598) in those words: "You (the Papists) and I agree in this, that in the Sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into Heaven, which sits on the right hand of God the Father, etc., only we differ in the way and manner of being there."¹ Add to these Bishop Ken's *Exposition*, licensed 1685: "O God incarnate, how Thou canst give us Thy Flesh to eat and Thy Blood to drink; how Thy Flesh is meat indeed; how Thou who art in heaven art present on the altar, I can by no means explain; but I firmly believe it all, because Thou hast said it, and I firmly rely on Thy love and on Thy omnipotence to make good Thy word, though the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend."

¹ [See Oxford ed. of 1839, pp. 248, 249.]

SECTION I.

Of the Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist.

For explication of this belief of Christ's Real Presence, some go so far as to declare that He ought to be adored in the Eucharist.

Bishop Andrewes, as above: "*Rex Christum in Eucharistia vere præsentem, vere et adorandum statuit.*" And, "*Nos vero in mysteriis Carnem Christi adoramus cum Ambrosio,*" etc. "The king (he speaks of King James I.) acknowledges Christ to be truly present, and truly to be adored in the Eucharist. I also with St. Ambrose adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries."¹

Bishop Forbes: "*An Christus in Eucharistia sit adorandus, Protestantes saniores non dubitant. In sumptione enim Eucharistiæ adorandus est Christus vera latria.*" And, "*Immanis est rigidorum Protestantium error, qui negant Christum in Eucharistia esse adorandum, nisi adoratione interna et mentali, non autem, externo aliquo ritu adorativo, ut in geniculatione, aut aliquo alio consimili corporis situ; hi fere omnes male de præsentia Christi Domini in Sacramento, miro sed vero modo, præsentis, sentiunt.*"² "The sounder Protestants make no doubt of adoring Christ in the Eucharist. For in receiving the Eucharist, Christ is to be

¹ Andrewes, *Resp. ad Bellarm.* cap. viii. p. 195 [pp. 266, 267, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*].

² Forbes, *Consid. Modest.* De Euch. L. 2, cap. ii. 9, 8. [This is precisely the Tridentine doctrine. See *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xiii. can. 7: "Si quis dixerit in sancto Eucharistiæ Sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latriæ, etiam externo, adorandum . . . anathema sit."]

adored with true *latria*. It is a monstrous error of the rigid Protestants, who deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist, except only with an inward adoration of the mind, but not with any outward act of adoration, as kneeling or other like posture of the body. All these do not believe aright of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament: present there after a wonderful but real manner."

Mr. Thorndike: "I suppose," says he, "the Body and Blood of Christ may be adored wheresoever they are, and must be adored by a good Christian where the custom of the Church, which a Christian is obliged to communicate with, requires it. . . . And is not the presence thereof in the Sacrament of the Eucharist a just occasion presently to express by that bodily act of adoration that inward honour which we always carry towards our Lord Christ, as God?" "Not to balk that freedom," says he, "which hath carried me to publish all this, I do believe that it was so practised and done in the ancient Church, which I maintain from the beginning to have been the true Church of Christ, obliging all to conform to it in all things within the power of it."¹

The last rubric at the Communion Service against adoration needs not give any trouble herein, since it was there added after the whole book had passed the Convocation. And besides, it is not there said that no adoration is intended or ought to be done unto any *real* and *essential* presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood (as it was in King Edward's second Liturgy, and

¹ Thorndike, *Epil.* B. iii. ch. 30. [*Works*, vol. iv. Pt. 2, pp. 753, 754, 755.]

therefore left out under Queen Elizabeth, and onwards till 1662), but it is unto any *corporal presence*. Which alters the case, and may with those other words, "the very natural substances," and "the natural body and blood," and with the reasons there given thereof, be better considered.

SECTION II.

Of the Manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist.

As for the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, I find both those of our own Church and the Church of Rome agree in terms, that it is ineffable, incomprehensible, above our reason, and a mystery of faith not to be discussed by reason.

Bishop Laud (*loc. cit.*) says of Bellarmine, "If the Cardinal had affirmed only Christ's real presence there, after a mysterious and ineffable manner, no man could have spoken better."

Bishop Forbes, speaking of Christ present in the Eucharist, expresses it thus: "*In sacra mensa modo ineffabili præsentem*,"—"Present on the holy table in an ineffable manner."¹

Bishop Andrewes (*loc. cit.*), "*De modo præsentia nec anxie inquiramus; inter mysteria ducimus; debet fide adorari, non ratione discuti*,"—"Of the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist let us not solicit-

¹ Forbes, *De Euch.*, L. iii. cap. i. 10.

ously inquire. We reckon it amongst mysteries. It is to be adored by faith, not discussed by reason."

I must add Bishop Cosin: "*Nos vero hunc modum,*" etc.,—"We confess with the holy fathers that the manner is ineffable and unsearchable, that is, not to be inquired and searched into by reason, but to be believed by faith alone. For although it seems incredible that in so great a distance of place Christ's flesh should come to us to become our food, yet we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit is above our understanding, and how foolish it is to measure His immensity by our capacity. But what our understanding comprehends not let faith conceive."¹

With whom take Calvin: "*Ego hoc mysterium minime rationis humanæ modo metior, vel naturæ legibus subjicio.*"² "*Porro de modo, si quis me interroget, fateri non pudebit, sublimius esse arcanum, quam ut vel meo ingenio comprehendere, vel enarrari verbis queat.*"³ "*Captivas tenemus mentes nostras, ne verbulo duntaxat obstrepere audeant.*"⁴ "I do not measure this mystery by human reason, nor subject it to the laws of nature. For if any ask of me concerning the manner, I will not be ashamed to confess that it is a mystery too high for me either to comprehend in thought or express in words. We captivate our minds, and suffer them not to mutter one word."

The *Gallican Confession*: "*Hoc mysterium,*" etc.

¹ Cosin, *Hist. Transubst.* iii. 3. [*Works*, vol. iv. p. 45, *Lib. Anglo-Cath.*]

² Calvin, *Inst.*, iv. cap. xvii. sect. 24.

³ *Ibid.* sect. 32.

⁴ *Ibid.* sect. 25.

"This mystery is so high that it is above all our understanding and the order of nature."¹

Hear now some of the other side, and observe whether they do not express themselves almost in the same terms.

Lanfranc, in his *Answer to Berengarius*: "*Si quæris modum, quo id fieri possit, breviter ad præsens respondeo: mysterium est fidei; credi salubriter potest, vestigari utiliter non potest.*" "If you inquire after the manner in which this can be done, I answer in short: It is a mystery of faith; it may safely be believed, but it cannot safely be searched into."²

¹ [The French Calvinists framed their Confession of Faith in a Synod at Paris, convoked by Antoine de Chantien.]

² [Archbishop Trench, in his *Lectures on Mediæval Church History* (Lect. xiii.), observes that the statements of Berengarius "would leave the words of Consecration a trope, and the Sacrament itself little more than a commemorative meal," and that his success in the controversy "would have been a calamity to the cause of truth," and he reminds us that Luther vehemently applauded his condemnation by Leo IX. He adds generally that the advocates of Transubstantiation, when it was first definitely formulised, came much nearer the truth always held by the Church than their opponents. The late Bishop Forbes (*Explan. of Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii. pp. 537 *sqq.*), speaks of Berengarius as "heretical," "vainglorious," and "dishonest," and shows that in spite of subtle evasions he denied any Real Presence at all in the Eucharist as entirely as a modern Calvinist, making it only "a sign of Christ's Body." And the *Catechismus ad Parochos* expressly affirms that it was to meet this denial, and preserve the ancient faith in the Real Presence, received throughout the Universal Church in all ages, that the fourth Lateran Council defined the doctrine of Transubstantiation (*Cat. ad Par. Pars ii. cap. iv. Q. 29*). Milman, whose sympathies are evidently with Berengarius, admits that he was a disciple of Scotus Erigena, whose teaching he not unjustly describes as "a vague Pantheism, singularly anticipative of that which in its various forms now rules in modern Germany."—*Lat. Christ.*, vol. iii. p. 389. On the whole, and viewing the matter from a simply human and historical point of view, it seems evident that the definition of Transubstantiation afforded the only security against what Trench calls "defining away the Presence into mere words, which, seeming to mean something, yet in fact meant nothing, or assuredly nothing with any right to so august a name."]

Dr. Holden: "*Verum et Reale*," etc.,—"We profess the true and real body of Christ to be in the Sacrament, after an invisible manner wholly unknown to us. *Fatemur hujusmodi supernaturalis conversionis substantialis modum nos penitus latere*. We confess the manner of this supernatural change is wholly hid from us."¹

The Council of Trent: "Christ's substance is sacramentally present in many other places, according to another manner of existence; which though we can hardly express in words, yet we can conceive in thought, enlightened by faith, that it is not impossible to God."²

SECTION III.

Something more Particular as to the Manner.

I find a more particular explication of the manner of Christ's Body being present in the Eucharist, and delivered on both sides alike. It is this: That Christ's Body is truly and really present in the Eucharist; but as to the manner of its being, it is not corporeal or after the manner of a body, but spiritual, that is, in the way of a spirit.

Hear how it is expressed by some divines of the Romanists. Holden (p. 316): "*Verum et reale*

¹ Holden, *Div. Fid. Analysis*, ii. 4. [Holden (1576-1665) was a Doctor of Theology at Paris, and author of various theological works. The one cited here was translated into English.]

² *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xiii. cap. i.

Corpus Christi profiteamur esse in hoc Sacramento: non more corporeo, et passibili, sed spirituali, et invisibili." "We profess the true and real body of Christ to be in the Sacrament: not in a corporeal and passible manner, but spiritual and invisible."

Likewise Veron, having declared the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, thus expounds the manner of His existence: "We may also say that Jesus Christ, according to His manner of being in the Sacrament, is as a spirit, and that He is there spiritually, that is, according to the nature of a spirit (John vi. 63, 'The words that I speak unto you are spirit and life') without being seen, without extension of parts, neither thick nor big as to the occupation of place, for spirits in their substances are thus truly said to be in places: in fine, that the Body of Jesus Christ is here spiritual and not sensual, since St. Paul avers the same of our bodies after the resurrection, 'It is sown a natural body, it will rise a spiritual' (1 Cor. xv. 44), to wit in quality, which shall be quite different, and yet the substance of the body not to perish."¹ Thus Veron.

Now hear the same on our side delivered by the eminent Bishop Taylor on this subject: "It is inquired (says he) whether, when we say we believe Christ's Body to be really in the Sacrament, we mean 'that Body, that flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary,' that was crucified, dead, and buried. I answer, I know none else that He had or hath: there is but one Body of Christ, natural and glorified; but he that

¹ Veron, *Reg. Fid.*, c. 5.

saith that Body is glorified which was crucified, says it is the same Body, but not after the same manner, and so it is in the Sacrament. We eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ that was broken and poured forth, for there is no other body, no other blood of Christ; but though it is the same we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner. And therefore when any of the Protestant divines, or any of the fathers, deny that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, to be eaten in the Sacrament—as Bertram, as St. Jerome, as Clemens Alexandrinus expressly affirm—the meaning is easy; they intend that it is not eaten in a natural sense. And then calling it *Corpus spirituale*, the word *spirituale* is not a substantial predicate, but is an affirmation of the manner, though in disputation it be made the predicate of a proposition, and the opposite member of a distinction. ‘That Body which was crucified is not that body that is eaten in the Sacrament,’ if the intention of the proposition be to speak of the eating it in the same manner of being; but ‘that Body which was crucified, the same Body we do eat,’ if the intention be to speak of the same thing in several manners of being and operating; and this I noted, that we may not be prejudiced by words when the notion is certain and easy. And thus far is the sense of our doctrine in this article.”¹ Again, “They that do not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, which flesh suffered for us, let them be anathema.”

Bishop Forbes: “The doctrine of those Protestants,”

¹ Taylor. [*Works*, Heber’s ed., vol. ix. p. 431 (On Real Presence).]

says he, "seems most safe and true, who are of opinion, nay most firmly believe, the Body and Blood of Christ to be truly and really and substantially present in the Eucharist, and to be received by the faithful; but that the manner of His being there is incomprehensible in respect of human reason, and ineffable, is known to God, and not revealed in the Scriptures."¹

But as we have seen some above explaining the manner in the common way of the schools, there are others of both sides who explain it upon other principles, by a consideration of the daily change of the bread we live upon into our bodies; with this difference, that the one is effected by the long way of eating and digesting it, whereas the other is suddenly done by the powerful operation of the Holy Ghost with the words of consecration, to which they seem to have been led, among others, by St. Gregory Nyssen, who, to make us more capable of this mystery, exemplifies in the change of the bread which Christ did eat into His own flesh, and whom they understand to tell us, that as the bread which God gives a blessing to does become our body, insomuch that one might accordingly in some sense be said to be the other, so here this bread is sanctified and made the Body of Christ, not by the usual process or way of manducation, but by being immediately changed into the Body of the Word as soon as it is said, "This is My Body." "*Ut enim illic Dei gratia sanctum efficit illud Corpus cujus firmamentum ex pane constabat, et ipsum etiam quodammodo panis erat, sic etiam hic panis per verbum Dei et*

¹ Forbes, *De Euch.*, L. i. c. ii. 7.

orationem sanctificatur; non quia comeditur eo progrediens ut Verbi Corpus evadat, sed statim per verbum in Corpus mutatur, ut dictum est a Verbo, Hoc est Corpus Meum."¹ S. Cyril of Jerusalem had before declared that our senses are not judges in this case. "With all assurance (saith he) receive the Body and Blood of Christ; for under the form of bread the Body is given to thee, and under the form of wine His Blood is given to thee." And again: "Thou must not consider it as bare bread and wine, for it is the Body and Blood of Christ, according to our Lord's own words; for though thy sense make thee think thus, yet faith must confirm thee that thou judge not the thing according to the taste." And again: "Know and be most assured that this bread which we see is not bread, though the taste think it bread, but it is the Body of Christ; and the wine which we see, though to the taste it seems wine, yet it is not wine, but the Blood of Christ."² But now, for the philosophy of all this, see the great Descartes. First, in his *Responsio ad quartas objectiones*, where the species are accounted for by the remaining superficies which only does sensibly affect us. Nor need this trouble us, since it often happens that things *appear* otherwise than they *are*. Next, in what we find in his *Life*, written in French (Liv. viii. chap. 9), where, from his letters to F. Mesland, we have this account of the change made in the B. Sacrament: that, "*Au lieu que les particules du pain,*" etc. "Whereas the particles of bread and

¹ Greg. Nyss., *Orat. Cat.* 37.

² Cyril, *Catech. Orat.* xxii. (De Myst. iv.).

wine should be mingled with the Blood of Jesus Christ, and there disposed in a particular manner that His Soul might particularly inform them, it does here inform them without that by force of the words of consecration. And whereas the Soul of Jesus Christ could not continue naturally joined with each of these particles of bread and wine, were they not accompanied with many others which compose all the organs of a human body necessary to life, it continues joined supernaturally to each of them, though they be separated." The new disposition here required for the reception of the soul does argue the change of the elements. But in the same chapter we may also see how this explication has been approved by several great men at Paris, Louvain, and elsewhere, which is here mentioned to show the liberty they take about the *modus*, while they do all at the same time agree in the *thing*.

SECTION IV.

Of Transubstantiation.

Hitherto we have proceeded with consent about the explication of the manner thereof. But the great point is still to be examined. And here, first, it is to be considered whether Transubstantiation be the *mode* or the *thing* itself, and what stress is to be laid upon the word. For which let us consult Dr. Parker, late Bishop of Oxford, in his *Reasons for Abrogating the*

Test: "I know (saith he) it is commonly said that the Council of Trent hath presumed to define the *modus*; and learned men (I know not by what fatal oversight) take it upon trust one from another; and the definition is generally given in these terms: That transubstantiation is wrought by the annihilation of the substance of the bread and wine, the accidents remaining, to the which annihilation succeeds the Body and Blood of Christ, under the accidents of bread and wine. So the Bishops of Durham and Winchester represent it; so Mr. Alix and the writers of his Church. But I cannot but wonder how so many learned men should with so much assurance fancy to themselves such a definition, in the Trent Council, of the *modus* of transubstantiation, by the *annihilation of the substance* and the *permanency of the accidents*, when the Fathers of that Council were so far from any such design, that they designed nothing more carefully than to avoid all scholastic definitions."¹ And a little after: "This is the definition of the Council of Trent of the Real Presence, that there is a conversion of the substances under the species and appearances of bread and wine, which the Church hath thought convenient to express by the word transubstantiation. And yet though the Council approve the word, yet it does not impose it; it only declares it to be convenient (fit and proper), but nowhere says it is necessary." And again: "Though perhaps all the Fathers of the Council believed the

¹ *Reasons for Abrogating Test*, pp. 23, 24. [Samuel Parker was made Bishop of Oxford in 1686, and published the work cited here in 1688. He was a friend of Archbishop Sheldon, and a member of the Royal Society, and author of several learned works.]

reality of the new substantial presence under the old accidents, yet they had more temper and discretion than to authorise it by conciliar determination, and therefore use only the word *species* (and no other word is used by Nicholas II., Gregory VII., and Innocent III., that are thought the three great innovators in the argument of the Real Presence), that properly signifies appearance, but nothing of physical or natural reality, so that though the presence under the species be real, yet as the Council hath defined it, it is not natural but sacramental, which sacramental Real Presence they express by the word transubstantiation, and recommend the propriety of the word to the acceptance of Christendom."¹

Next then I shall take the thing itself as I find it delivered by the Church of Rome, and then shall see how near we can come to it.

By the thing understood by Transubstantiation is meant in the Church of Rome, a change of the substances of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. And this, as the Council of Trent says, has been always the doctrine of that Church, though first solemnly declared in the [fourth] Council of Lateran."²

They confess that the word is not anywhere in Scripture. But they say the sense and full meaning of it, by necessary consequence at least, is delivered in the Gospel, and therefore certainly and necessarily true.³ And thus they explain themselves: Christ said

¹ *Reasons for Abrogating Test*, pp. 27, 28. ² *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xiii. cap. 4.

³ [The same may be said, *e.g.*, of the word "Trinity."]

it was His Body, which He gave under the species of bread. If it was really and indeed His Body, then, say they, it cannot be bread: because that which is bread cannot be really and indeed the true and real Body of Christ. Therefore that which was really bread is not now bread after the consecration, but is by the Divine power (which can change one thing into another) become the true Body of Christ. And this is what is called a conversion or change: and being not made in the outward accidents or appearance (which are still the same), but only in the substance, which is invisible, therefore they have framed a new word to express it, viz., transubstantiation. They clear this by an example.

As at the marriage-feast of Cana, that which was truly water is, by the power of Christ, made true and real wine; and it being now absolutely true that This is wine, it is no longer true, This is water; but that which was truly water is not water, but wine; so they understand in this mystery as to the substance: That which was truly bread, is now truly and really the Body of our Lord. Therefore if it be owned absolutely true, after consecration (as has been already shown), that This is My Body, it is not now truly bread, but that which was bread is now made to be truly and really the Body of Christ. As therefore at Cana He made the water wine, as it is said (John iv. 46), so at His last supper He made bread His Body. So that, according to their sentiments, they believe nothing more than what the express words of Christ oblige them to. And this the great [fourth] Lateran Council

declared, when this question was first debated, six hundred years ago [1215], and asserted that in this sense it had been delivered to them from the primitive Church; and accordingly they quote many testimonies of the ancient Fathers, seeming to concur in this very doctrine.¹ Thus they.

Now as to our side of the Church of England. I find some in the first place owning the possibility of transubstantiation. As Bishop Forbes, who thus delivers himself upon this subject: "Many Protestants," says he, "too boldly and dangerously deny that God has power to transubstantiate the bread into the Body of Christ. It is true, all own, that what implies contradiction cannot be done. But because in particular nobody certainly knows what is the essence of everything, and consequently what implies a contradiction and what not, it is without question a rashness in any to put limits to God's power. I approve the opinion of the divines of Wittemberg, who assert the power of God to be so great that He can change the substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ."²

Mr. Thorndike owns a change in fact where he says, "The elements are really changed from ordinary bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, mystically present as in a sacrament, and that in virtue of the consecration, not by the faith of him that receives."³

Bishop Montague asserts in the [table of] contents that the "consecration of the elements causeth a

¹ [*Conc. Lat.* iv. cap. i.]

² Forbes, *De Euch.*, L. i. cap. ii. *ad init.*

³ Thorndike, *Epil.*, B. iii. ch. v. [Vol. iv. Pt. i. p. 112, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*]

change," and in the body of the chapter cites several of the primitive fathers owning the same, as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "*Precamur Deum hominum amantem, ut emittat Sanctum Suum Spiritum in res propositas, ut faciat panem Corpus Christi, et vinum Sanguinem Christi.*" For, "*Quicquid contigerit Spiritus Sanctus, illud ipsum ἡγιάσται καὶ μεταβέβληται*, says St. Basil in his Liturgy."¹ ("We beseech God, the lover of men, to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the things proposed, that He would make the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ. For whatever the Holy Ghost touches, that thing is sanctified and changed.") St. Cyprian: "*Iste panis, quem discipulis Suis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia Verbi factus est caro. Et sicut in Persona Christi humanitas videbatur, latebat divinitas; ita Sacramento visibili, invisibiliter divina se infundit Substantia.*" ("That bread which our Lord gave to His disciples, not changed in outward form but in nature, by the almighty power of the Word, was made flesh. And as in the Person of Christ His humanity was seen and His divinity was hid, so in the visible Sacrament the Divine Substance invisibly infuses itself.") St. Ambrose: "Before consecration it was bread, common bread, but after consecration it becometh the Flesh of Christ, because then the Sacrament is consummate." And the same Father: "*Forte dices, meus panis est usitatus; sed panis iste, ante verba sacramentorum, panis est; ubi accesserit consecratio de pane fit Caro Christi.*" ("Perhaps you will say, My bread

¹ Cyr. *Catech.*, Orat. xxiii. (De Myst. v.)

is common bread, but this bread before the sacramental words is bread, but when it is consecrated, of bread it is made the Flesh of Christ.")¹

Then he remarks how this change is termed by the ancient Fathers, St. Cyril asserting in this mystery *μεταβολή*, Theophylact *μεταποίησις*, Gregory Nyssen *μετασχηματισμός*, St. Chrysostom *μεταστοιχείωσις*, and the Bishop after this calling it a transmutation and trans-elementation. But however, though this prelate goes so far in confessing a change upon consecration, and that it has been so believed by the primitive Church, yet he is not for transubstantiation, but positively declares against it.²

The Bishop of Oxford before mentioned should here also be heard in what he says to this point, in his *Reasons against the Test*. "It is evident," saith he, "to all men that are but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical learning, that the ancient fathers from age to age asserted the *real* and *substantial* presence in very high and expressive terms. The Greeks styled it *μεταβολή*, *μεταρρύθμισις*, *μετασκευασμός*, *μεταποίησις*, *μετασχηματισμός*; and the Latins, agreeable with the Greeks, *conversion*, *transmutation*, *transformation*, *transfiguration*, *transelementation*, and at length *transubstantiation*; by all which they expressed nothing more nor less than the *real* and *substantial* presence in the Eucharist" (p. 13). And afterwards: "In the Greek form," saith he, "of consecration this prayer was used: 'Make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that which is in

¹ Montague, *Just Appeal*, ch. xxxi. pp. 292 *sqq.*

² *Ibid.* p. 294.

this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ, changing them by Thy Holy Spirit;' which words are taken out of the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil. And Jeremias, the learned Patriarch of Constantinople, in his declaration of the faith of the Greek Church, in answer to the Lutheran divines, affirms that 'the Catholic Church believes that after the consecration the bread is changed into the very Body of Christ, and the wine into the very Blood, by the Holy Spirit'" (p. 33). And having both before and after this given the judgment of foreign Churches, he concludes thus: "This is the account of this controversy in all foreign Churches. All parties of Christendom agree in the substance of the doctrine, even the Calvinists themselves, who, though they sometimes attempted to deny it, had not confidence enough to be steady to their own opinion, but were often forced to submit it to the consent of Christendom" (p. 46). And a little after: "As for the Church," saith he, "of England, she agrees with the tradition of the Catholic Church in asserting the certainty of the Real Presence and the uncertainty of the manner of it, though the true account of it hath been miserably perplexed and disturbed by the oblique practices of the Sacramentarians" (p. 47).

I have been large in the citations from my authors, to show how far has been taught and believed in our Church, and how far may still be believed in her communion. And to sum up now in a few words what concessions have been made within her pale, they are these, viz., that Christ is not only figuratively in the

Sacrament, but His Body is truly and really present, the same Body which was born of the Virgin Mary and crucified; that the manner of His being in the Sacrament is wonderful, and almost wholly ineffable, not to be fully comprehended by human reason; that Christ is so present in the Eucharist that He may and ought to be there adored; that this His presence is effected by a change or conversion wrought by an almighty power in virtue of the words of consecration.

So far has been taught by our own prelates, and may still be believed within our communion; and the very same is taught by the Church of Rome: so that none will be questioned in that Church, of not being orthodox, as to this point, who makes this profession.

And why then may there not be hopes of accommodation in this grand point, when that which is a sufficient profession to be admitted into one communion, is taught and allowed in the other? Private persons, and even pastors, who thus believe and teach, are not cast out of our communion on this account. And why then should we separate communion from a Church upon the same?

It is true, that transubstantiation has occasioned great heats; but may there not be here some hopes of peace? It is pity a piece of logic should divide Churches and disturb the world. For my part, upon a serious perusal of the Council of Trent, and their best divines, I can discover nothing more in it. Divines on both sides eminent agree, *Hoc est Corpus Meum*, "This is My Body," allowing the real presence of Christ's true Body, for verifying the proposition.

We agree about the *Hoc est*, says Bishop Andrewes. This is the substantial point; in this then is an agreement about the presence of Christ. Now the Romanists go on, and say, that for verifying the proposition, *Hoc est Corpus Meum*, we must believe farther. For the proposition (say they) asserting, "This is My Body," cannot be true, in the sense as now agreed on, except it be His Body; and if it be His Body, then it is not bread, but that which was bread is made His Body; and this is all their Transubstantiation. Now what is this but a piece of logic, even a dispute of what is required to the verifying a proposition? It is true, besides the logic, they say, it is a truth they have so received from the primitive Church, and therefore upon this head are bound not to depart from it; but as to us, those amongst us who confess a real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and confess it so as to declare there is no difference between the two Churches in this point, these, I say, seem to offer fair for compounding all the rest. For whilst they in this own the subject of this mystery to be above the laws of nature, to be above the reach of reason, that it is wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost, that it is the effect of an Almighty Power, and assert this from antiquity, do not they here surrender the whole cause out of the hands of reason, and submit entirely to faith, and having advanced so far, what can be the objections, after this, from natural philosophy, or logic, in a point already confessed to be above their inquiry?

Thus, from these concessions of our own learned prelates, I raise hopes of peace, and am confirmed in my

hopes by the learned Grotius, who, having duly weighed this whole matter, says, first, it is the explications of schoolmen create the offence that is taken against the word transubstantiation, which explications we may lay by. Secondly, he joins with our prelates as to the chief point, declaring in these words: "The Fathers and very many Protestants do affirm it for certain, that together with the signs, the thing itself is exhibited; but in a manner that is not perceptible by the external senses." And then, lastly, he makes this conclusion upon the whole question in debate: "To speak my heart," says he, "I think that many disputers do understand well enough the sense of the ancient Church, and of the present Greek and Latin: but they dissemble it, that they may have matter to declaim upon, among those that make more use of their outward senses than their inward." Here is Grotius's judgment in this great point as set down in a small collection in English, translated out of his *Vote for Peace* (p. 92), "Of Transubstantiation."¹ And while he, upon so strict a search and such mature deliberation thus pronounces, may it not be hoped that the love of peace and compassion to divided Christendom will influence so strongly some pious breasts, as not to let school opinions and the love of wrangling keep up those heats, which inflame the world, and consume religion under the notion of refining it?

¹ [*Votum pro Pace*, ad art. x.]

SECTION V.

Of the Mass.

By this word Mass, which was used by St. Ambrose, and also in the first Liturgy of King Edward VI., I find the Romanists mean no more than the performing, as to this point, that which Christ did at His last Supper, when He gave His Apostles, and by them to their successors, power of consecrating the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and commanded them to do what He had there done, in remembrance of His death and Passion on the cross. Now while Christ is here offered, in testimony of God being the Sovereign Lord of life and death, they call this offering a sacrifice. And Christ being here offered under the forms of bread and wine, therefore they term it an unbloody sacrifice. And this being done in remembrance of Christ being offered for our sins, a Sacrifice on the cross, hence they call it a commemorative sacrifice. And while the virtue of Christ's Passion is applied to Christians by means of this offering, as it is likewise by acts of faith, of prayer, and contrition—which are therefore truly propitiatory—hence they declare this offering to be propitiatory. This is the explication given by them, conformable to what is delivered upon this point in the Council of Trent.¹

The substance of this doctrine I find delivered by Mr. Thorndike, where having maintained that the elements are really changed from ordinary bread and

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xxii. cap. 1.

wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, mystically present, as in a sacrament, and that in virtue of the consecration, not by the faith of him that receives, he then adds thus : “ I am to admit and maintain whatsoever appears duly consequent to this truth : namely, that the elements so consecrated are truly the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, inasmuch as the Body and Blood of Christ are contained in them.” Then he farther collects thus : “ And the sacrifice of the cross, being necessarily propitiatory and impetratory both, it cannot be denied that the Sacrament of the Eucharist, inasmuch as it is the same sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, is also both propitiatory and impetratory.”¹

Bishop Forbes comes up to the same : “ *Dicunt etiam sæpissime sancti patres in Eucharistia offerri et sacrificari ipsum Christi Corpus, ut ex innumeris pene locis constat.*” “ The holy fathers very frequently say, that in the Eucharist is offered and sacrificed the very Body of Christ, as is evident in infinite places. Not that all the conditions of a sacrifice are here properly and really found ; but by a commemoration and representation of that which was once offered in that only sacrifice of the cross, in which Christ our High Priest consummated all other sacrifices ; and by a pious supplication, in which the ministers of the Church, with all humility, beseech God the Father, that for the sake of the perpetual Victim of that only Sacrifice, sitting at the right hand of His Father in Heaven, and present upon the holy table in an ineffable manner, He would cause the virtue and grace of this standing

¹ Thorndike, *Epil.* B. iii. ch. v. [Vol. iv. Pt. i. pp. 112, 117.]

Victim to be efficacious, and advantageous to His Church, for the remedy of all necessities, both of body and soul.”¹

The same prelate asserts yet plainer : “ This sacrifice of the Supper is not only propitiatory, and may be offered up for the remission of our daily sins ; but likewise is impetratory, and may be rightly offered for the obtaining all blessings.” And then he adds, “ Although the Scripture does not plainly and in express words teach this, yet the holy fathers with unanimous consent have thus understood the Scriptures, as has at large been demonstrated by many. And all the ancient Liturgies prescribe, that in time of the oblation prayers be offered for peace, for the fruits of the earth, and for other temporal benefits, as it is evident to all.”²

In this point I see but little difference, but that which is taught in the Church of Rome is taught and contended for within the pale of the Church of England, and this by men of learning and note.³ But for making it still more plain, hear what is the judgment of Grotius. “ The Church,” says he, “ commemorating the sacrifice of Christ, with the usual rite and words, in this also sacrificeth and offers that which is her own, given unto her by Christ. That she setteth before the eyes of God ; by that she beseecheth God.

¹ Forbes, *De Euch.*, L. iii. cap. i. 10.

² *Ibid.* L. iii. cap. ii. 12.

³ [“ The (Thirty-first) Article was not directed against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as explained by Bossuet, Veron, and others, with which we have no material fault to find.”—Palmer’s *Treatise on the Church*, vol. ii. p. 347.]

And it is the same sacrifice that Christ offered ; the same one, true, and singular sacrifice to Augustine ; a sacrifice of memory to Eusebius ; a spiritual sacrifice to others. After that, the faithful offer themselves, according to the example of Christ, their goods, their labours, their life also ; if not in effect, in affection, as Abraham sacrificing offered his son. In all this what is there new ? what deformed ? what hurtful ? But minds once distracted do distract all things into a depraved meaning, and then are glad to find a hint for it in any of the schools.”¹

¹ [*Votum pro Pace*, ad art. x. On the Sacrifice of the Mass Anglican readers will do well to consult Bishop Forbes's chapter on Art. 31, in his *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (vol. ii. pp. 599 *sqq.*), with the patristic and Anglican authorities there quoted. One passage shall be given here: “The Sacrifice of the Eucharist is substantially the same as the Sacrifice of the Cross, because the Priest is the same in both, and the Victim is the same in both, just as the sacrifice which Christ the Eternal Priest is now presenting to His Father in heaven is the same which He offered upon the Cross, because He Himself is the same Victim and Priest both in one. But there is a difference. There is a difference in the manner of offering. In heaven Christ is not offering Himself in the same manner as He did upon the Cross” (p. 607). And the same author's exposition of the 28th Article may be consulted in reference to the doctrine of the Real Presence. It can hardly be necessary to refer to the late Archdeacon Wilberforce's learned (Anglican) work on the *Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, where both the scriptural and patristic argument are carefully examined, as regards both the Presence and the Sacrifice, the latter of which of course depends on the reality of the Presence. The scriptural argument is examined, with special reference to Oriental languages, in Cardinal Wiseman's *Real Presence in the Blessed Eucharist proved from Scripture*. On the philosophical objections raised I may refer to the first two chapters of *Holy Communion*, by Dalgairns. See also Döllinger's exposition of the Scriptural doctrine in *First Age of Church*, vol. ii. pp. 44 *sqq.* (third edit.) The term “Sacrifice of praise” (*sacrificium laudis*), which occurs in the Canon of the Mass, has been retained in the English Communion Office.]

CHAPTER VI.

Of Communion in one Kind.

QUEST. I. Whether the Church of Rome does not act contrary to the command of Christ in forbidding the people the use of the cup ?

It is one of our rules never to charge upon men the consequences of their opinions when they expressly disown them. This seems to be our present case. For though it be true that in the Church of Rome is denied the cup to the people, yet they deny this to be contrary to Christ's command. And could it be made evident to them that this is contrary to the command of Christ, I have reason to believe they would abhor the practice. My reason is, because upon full examination into their principles, profession, books of devotion, and instruction, I find they believe in Christ in the same manner as is taught by us in the Church of England ; they profess Him to be the supreme Law-giver ; that He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life ; that His Gospel is such a rule of salvation, that whoever lives in the known transgression of it can have no part in Christ. This I assert upon my own knowledge ; and therefore as to the charge in this point, of their

acting contrary to the command of Christ, it is a consequence which they utterly deny, and hence falling under the rule now mentioned, ought not to be pressed.

QUEST. II. Whether it be not evident that Christ gave express command to all to drink of the cup, in those words, "Drink ye all of this:" and therefore the practice of denying the cup utterly to be abhorred?

This being a charge against the Romanists, it is but just they should speak for themselves; therefore I here set down the defence they make.

They with us own these words spoken by Christ, "Drink ye all of this;" they own them likewise to be a plain command; but to those to whom Christ spoke them, that is, to the Apostles (and to their successors) whom He then made priests, and gave them power to consecrate the elements, as He had done; for that as the power of consecrating, which Christ then gave to the Apostles, is not to be extended to the laity, so neither the command of drinking, which He gave at the same time. This they explain by several other commands of Christ given to the Apostles; as "Go and teach all nations," "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye forgive, they are forgiven," etc., with others of this kind, in which it is plain what Christ spoke to His Apostles and to their successors is not all intended or directed to the people. Thus they confess the evidence of the command, but say, there is no evidence from Scripture that this was a command given by Christ to the laity.¹

¹ [Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 27, where the original text is, "Whosoever eateth this bread *or* (not *and*) drinketh this cup of the Lord unworthily." Alford *in loc.* admits that "the meaning is most unfairly changed in our E. V."]

QUEST. III. Whether the practice of the primitive Church, in giving the Sacrament in both kinds, be not evidence that Christ's words were understood as a command to the laity ?

The Romanists agree with us, and own that it was the most general practice of the primitive Church for all to receive in both kinds, even for eleven hundred years ; but then they say, that the Church did not do this, as judging it necessary to be so done, in obedience to any command of Christ, who had enjoined it to be given in both kinds. And this they prove from matter of fact, it being evident in the records of antiquity that in the purest ages it was the practice in many cases to give the Communion in one kind only ; as to the solitaries, to whom it was carried into the desert, to the sick, to persons on a journey, to infants, to the abstemious. And for some time also, in some places, in the ordinary Communion at Church, as appears from St. Leo the Great and St. Gelasius, who was his successor in the Roman See, being likewise taken notice of by Cassander and Grotius. Now this being practised by the ancient Church, it is most evident, say they, it was judged then to be good and lawful to receive in one kind, which yet they could not judge if it had been their sentiment that Christ had left a command for all to receive in both ; for in this supposition it must have been abhorred as a thing contrary to a plain precept of Christ.

Hence again the Romanists argue from this allowed practice, that as the primitive Church judged it good and lawful to receive in both kinds, so they likewise

judged it good and lawful (upon some motives and circumstances) to receive in one kind, and consequently that the manner of receiving, whether in both kinds or one, was no matter of precept, but subject to difference of practice, according to circumstances, and therefore reputed as a point of discipline, capable of change. And this is the very sentiment of the Roman Church. For they say, it is good to receive in one kind; and likewise, that it is good to receive in both. It was the general practice formerly to receive in both kinds, and so it may be again. This was the sense of the Church even before the restraint was laid by the Council of Constance; it being evident from history that several bishops, observing the irreverences committed in giving the cup, forbad it to be given to the laity in their dioceses, even before the meeting of that Council, as it was likewise done by the Cistercian Order, which plainly shows that the receiving in both kinds or one was judged no matter of precept, but only of discipline, determinable by circumstances.¹ In which sentiment, it may be presumed, the Greek Church did concur, who laying hold on all arguments to justify their not communicating with the Latin Church, never mentioned this of forbidding the cup to the laity, which they would certainly have done had they judged the receiving in both kinds to have been of precept.

So far at least the present Greek Church concurs with the Latin as not to take those words of Christ

¹ [The custom of wearing beards, which came into vogue in the thirteenth century, was one reason for withdrawing the chalice.]

“Drink ye all of this,” to be a precept in the literal sense, whilst it nowhere gives the cup to the laity to drink, but communicates the people with the symbol of Christ’s Body intinct in that of His Blood taken out of the chalice with a little spoon and so put into their mouths, which is not literally drinking of the cup. And the sick they communicate only with the symbol of Christ’s Body consecrated on Maundy-Thursday for all the year following, and then on that day besprinkled with the symbol of His Blood, and at the same time dried and hardened over the fire, and softened again for the sick with common wine at the time when they administer it. The former way then of communicating the people generally in both kinds has been changed in both Churches, and upon the same grounds, namely, upon the many and great irreverences that have happened in giving the consecrated bread into their hands, and in allowing so many communicants of all ages and conditions to drink out of the cup. And while changed in fact in the present Greek and Latin Churches, and differently administered in the primitive Church, that is never giving it in both kinds when there was danger of irreverence by administering it in both; hence they argue that the manner of administering the Sacrament is only of discipline, and alterable, and that the sense of the primitive Church was the same as now it is in the Greek and Latin, viz., that wherever there is danger of irreverence in giving the Sacrament in both kinds there is no precept for so giving it, but it may be lawfully and profitably given in one.

These are some of the reasons upon which the Church of Rome proceeds, and endeavours to prove that the giving the cup to all is not of precept, and consequently that she transgresses no precept in forbidding it, upon due motives, to the laity. Now upon examination, I find several leading men of the Reformation, and even some of note in our own Church, agreeing with the Romanists, and owning that Christ has nowhere in Scripture given command for all to receive in both kinds:—as Bishop Forbes, who owns the primitive practice of giving the Communion in one kind, in particular cases, and Bishop White and Bishop Montague, who say the authority for giving it in both kinds is rather from tradition than Scripture.¹ So far do these learned men grant, and in this contribute to the accommodating this considerable point. For if it can be allowed in our Church that there is no precept in Scripture for giving the Sacrament in both kinds, then in our Church we may confess that it is not contrary to any precept to forbid the cup to the laity; and consequently, according to our sixth rule, this ought not to be made the breach of communion, since it is not a practice against the laws of God. But if we cannot do this, yet still peace ought not to be despaired on this account, since the Church of Rome, owning this to be a point of discipline only, and therefore alterable, can yield to us in this point, as it did to the Emperor Ferdinand, an. 1564, in granting the use of the cup to the laity in the German nation upon the hopes of gaining that people, by such condescension, to

¹ [So also Grotius, *Consult. Cassand.* ad art. xxii.]

the unity of the Church, it having been left by the Council of Constance to the Pope's prudence to grant leave to any nation or people of communicating in both kinds, as he should judge reasonable.¹ What therefore has been already done, upon the desire of peace, may be done again upon the same motive, as it was indeed offered by the Pope to Queen Elizabeth.

QUEST. IV. Whether the decree of Constance was with a *non obstante* to Christ's command?

This could not be in their system, since they positively assert that there was no such command of Christ. It was *non obstante institutione*. That although Christ ordained it in both kinds in regard to the Apostles and the exercise of priestly function, yet still the cup might, upon due motives, be denied to the laity; which alters the case, and answers the question so as not to be made an exception against Catholic communion.²

QUEST. V. Whether the denial of the cup be not defrauding the laity?

This seems a consequence, according to our common opinion of the Sacrament, but in the sense of the Church of Rome it seems not just to charge it upon them. For while they firmly believe and teach (and some of ours hold with them) that not only the virtue and benefits of Christ's Passion is applied by the Sacrament, but likewise that Christ is really given to the

¹ [The Uniates, it need hardly be said, are always allowed to receive in both kinds.]

² [*Conc. Const.*, Sess. xiii. The phrase "non obstante" occurs in the decree, referring to the original administration in both kinds, and after supper. It means of course that neither incident is part of the divine institution. The decree goes on to assert the doctrine of concomitance.]

communicant, it is certain, according to this doctrine, that no more is received in both kinds than in one. It is Christ is given in one kind, and no more than Christ in both; and who can say that having Christ communicated unto them they are defrauded of anything, while in Christ they have and possess all?¹ Besides that, no priest, bishop, or pope receives otherwise than the laity in one kind only, unless they consecrate, and then it is for the sacrifice that both kinds are necessary, not for the communion. So that here none can suspect any fraud. As to the thing received, it is the very same received both by laity and clergy; all the

¹ [The doctrine of concomitance necessarily and directly follows from the truth of the Real Presence, unless the profane and indeed impossible heresy be maintained—which even Jewell rejected as “a new error never defended or imagined before,” but which two or three crotchety moderns have attempted to revive—of the Presence of the dead, instead of the Living Body of our Lord in the Sacrament. For by virtue of the Hypostatic Union His Soul and Divinity are indissolubly and for ever united to both His Body and His Blood, and, except during the brief interval between His death and resurrection, His Body and Blood have ever been, and must henceforth for ever remain, indissolubly united to each other. While therefore, by direct virtue of consecration, the Body alone is present under the form of bread, and the Blood under the form of wine, yet it follows from this essential concomitance, or, in other words, from the unity of His Divine Person, that the Blood is equally present in the Host, and the Body in the Chalice, because Christ Himself in the totality of His Person—Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity—is equally present under either kind. Hence from the earliest ages infants were communicated under the form of wine only throughout the whole Church, as is still the practice of the East, while confessors—a very numerous class in the ages of persecution—and the sick were everywhere communicated, as at present, under the form of bread only. Yet all alike received, not a divided, but an entire Christ. The question of reception under one or both kinds is then one of discipline, not of doctrine. According to the existing Western discipline, it is not the laity, *quâ* laity, but all, except the priest actually engaged in offering the Holy Sacrifice, who receive under one kind only; the same rule applies to laymen, and to ecclesiastics of all grades when communicating, but not saying Mass. On the other hand, the Uniates, with the full sanction of the Holy See, follow the general Eastern rule of receiving the chalice also.]

difference is in the *manner* of receiving. And while this *manner* has been various in all times, according to circumstances, without the least suspicion of any defrauding, it seems not reasonable to press this charge now, especially since, according to our fourth rule, the consequences of men's opinions ought not to be charged upon them, such consequences at least as they deny and apprehend no reason to suspect.

Thus there may be hopes of compounding this point, whilst if we cannot come over to them, they may yield here and come to us.

CHAPTER VII.

Of Praying for the Dead, and Purgatory.

QUEST. I. Whether the preaching up purgatory does not make persons bold in sin and neglect repentance ?

If it does, it is a great abuse, which that Church does not approve, much less impose on any, and therefore ought not, according to our second rule, be pressed as an occasion of distinct communion. By what I observe in their spiritual books, they press the necessity of true repentance as much as we can desire. But if libertines amongst them observe not such directions, this cannot in justice be cast upon purgatory, since it is evident they live in defiance of hell, and through want of faith, or blindness, put all to the hazard. And are these nowhere to be found but where purgatory is taught ?

QUEST. II. Whether their praying for the most wicked sinners be not a proof that they think purgatory a shelter for all crimes ?

They positively believe, as we do, that as the very good and faithful servants of God go directly to heaven, so sinners, who die without a sincere repentance, go

directly to hell. In this we agree.¹ But because the inward state of a dying Christian is unknown to them, therefore suspending all judging in a case wherein not they but God alone is judge, they let charity prevail, which supposing and hoping the best, prays for all such as die; knowing that if the souls for which they pray are not capable of relief, yet their prayers will not be lost before God, who is the faithful Rewarder of charity, even though it happens to be misapplied. Just as the apostolical salutation, "Peace be to this house," was not lost even in a house where there was no son of peace; for that in this case Christ promised the peace should return to their benefit who made the prayer of peace for their neighbour. Thus they expound their charity, and it being an innocent piety, if not well grounded, it need be no occasion of breach between us.

QUEST. III. Whether the doctrine of purgatory be not a point of mere gain, and many ridiculous deliverances from that prison pretended for making the people liberal in opening their purses for their interest who serve the altar?

I cannot but fear great abuses in a case where money is stirring, for so it was even in the purest times of the Apostles. But whatever these abuses are, upon examination I find that Church approves not of such abuses, but in the Council of Trent takes

¹[It need hardly be observed that the heterodox view, from which the author thought it necessary to vindicate the Church of Rome, has now through the denial of purgatory become popular among Protestants. The editor may perhaps be allowed to refer, on the whole subject of purgatory, to his recent work on *Catholic Eschatology and Universalism*.]

notice of them, and strictly gives it in charge to the bishops to take care for their being reformed. There they are first enjoined that nothing be taught of purgatory but according to what is delivered by the holy Fathers and sacred Councils. Secondly, that they suffer nothing to be published or preached which can be suspected of being false or uncertain. Thirdly, that they forbid and take away all that savours of superstition or filthy lucre, as being scandals and stumbling-blocks to the faithful.¹ Now, while that Church is so far from imposing such abuses and ill practices that she joins with us in desiring and requiring their reformation, this question, according to our second rule, may be laid by and be made no hindrance to communion, since the communion here proposed is not with the corruptions of churchmen, but with the Church, which declares against such corruptions, though not wholly removed for want of due execution of her injunctions.

QUEST. IV. Whether praying for the souls of such as are dead be not vain and superstitious, and being nowhere found in Scripture is a practice which cannot be joined with or approved?

The Church of Rome confesses this practice to be nowhere taught in Scripture more plainly than in the apocryphal books, as 2 Macc. xii. 43-46.² But then she says this doctrine and practice has been delivered down in all ages, even the most primitive, not only in the writings of the Fathers, but by the

¹ *Conc. Trid.* Sess. 25, De Purgat.

² [This is not quite accurate. There is abundance of at least indirect Scriptural authority for the practice both in the Old and New Testament, e.g. in 2 Tim. i. 18.]

agreeing practice of the universal Church, that it cannot be questioned to have been ordained by the Apostles and received from them by all Christian Churches, wherever the Gospel was preached by them.

I have examined this point, and must confess I have found very great authority for it both in consent of fathers and ancient practice. But having undertaken only to relate, I insert not my own thoughts, but the judgment of others. And for this point hear first what the late Duchess of York says in her paper: "I spoke severally to two of the best bishops we have in England (Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Blandford, Bishop of Worcester), who both told me there were many things in the Roman Church which it were very much to be wished we had kept, as confession, which was no doubt commanded by God; that praying for the dead was one of the ancient things in Christianity; that for their parts they did it daily, though they would not own it." But next, it may be of good use also to set down here the epitaphs which Bishop Barrow of St. Asaph and Mr. Thorndike, a prebendary of Westminster, left for themselves. The first is: "*Exuvie Isaaci Asaphensis Episcopi, in manum Domini depositæ, in spem lætæ resurrectionis per sola Christi merita. O vos trans-euntes in domum Domini, domum orationis, orate pro conservo vestro, ut inveniatur misericordiam in die Domini.*" The other is: "*Hic jacet corpus Herberti Thorndike, quondam hujus Ecclesiæ præbendarij, qui vivus veram reformatæ Ecclesiæ rationem et modum precibus studiisque prosequabatur. Tu lector requiem*

ei et beatam in Christo resurrectionem precare." And before these was that other eminent prelate, I mean Bishop Forbes, who was very free to tell us his thoughts in his *Discourse of Purgatory*.¹

"Let not the ancient practice," says he, "of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the universal Church of Christ, almost from the very time of the Apostles, be any more rejected by Protestants as unlawful or vain. Let them reverence the judgment of the primitive Church, and admit a practice strengthened by the uninterrupted profession of so many ages. And let them as well in public as private observe this right, although not as absolutely necessary or commanded by the Divine law, yet as lawful and likewise profitable, and as always approved by the universal Church, that by this means at length a peace so earnestly desired by all learned and honest men may be restored to the Christian world."²

Again: "The universal Church," says he, "has believed this practice not only to be lawful, but likewise beneficial to the souls departed, and has always most religiously observed it as delivered, if not from the Apostles, at least from the primitive fathers, as is manifest in many places of their writings. Let it be granted that this custom was always judged lawful and also profitable by pious antiquity, and most universally

¹ [So also the late Bishop Forbes of Brechin: "However people may wish to disparage the testimony of the early Liturgies, it is a fact which cannot be gainsaid, that in every one of them, without exception, there is a commemoration of the faithful departed. The entire universality of the practice must remove any ground for doubt on the subject."—*Explan. Thirty-nine Articles*, vol. ii. p. 610.]

² Forbes [*Consid. Modest. De Purg. cap. iii. ad fin.*]

received at all times in the Church.”¹ And then he declares that it is evident in Epiphanius and St. Augustine that the contrary opinion of Aërius, who opposed prayers and oblations for the dead, was condemned.²

Again: he confesses “that very many of the primitive Fathers [relying on 2 Macc. xii. 43-46, and Matt. vii. 32] were of opinion that some light offences, not remitted in this life as to their guilt and punishment, were forgiven after death by the intercession of the Church in her public prayers, and especially those which were offered up in the celebration of the tremendous mysteries, as likewise by the prayers, oblations, or alms given for them by private persons. Many Councils concur with these Fathers, and the most ancient practice of the Church, not to be slighted or rashly rejected by any, unless it evidently be against the Scripture, which in this matter will be very hard to be proved.”³ And again: “It is no absurdity,” says he [quoting De Dominis], “to own that lighter sins, such as were not remitted in this life, are discharged after death, and that soon after the decease; while the ecclesiastical rites are piously and religiously performed in virtue of the intercession of the Church in her public prayers, and particularly those which are poured forth in the celebration of the sacred Liturgy.” Again: “These things which I have said of the remission of venial sin after death, through the mediation of the Church, may be allowed

¹ [Forbes, *Consid. Modest.* De Purg. cap. iv. *ad fin.*, where he quotes the opinion of Casaubon.]

² [*Ibid.* iii. 17.]

³ [*Ibid.* iii. 28.]

as not wanting its probable grounds, that so we may maintain the prayers of the Church for the souls departed to be beneficial and not in vain, inasmuch as that practice of the Church of praying for the dead is derived, as Chrysostom confesses, and is very probable, from the institution of the Apostles."¹

Thus is it asserted, and so great is the authority of this practice of praying for the dead acknowledged by a prelate of our own Church, who, for promoting the general peace of the Christian world, had taken pains to look into antiquity; thus he delivers his sense, and lays grounds for a good accommodation of this point, which yet, according to our fifth rule, ought not to be made the occasion of separation, since though not in Scripture, yet it is not contrary to or forbid in Scripture.

QUEST. V. Whether the Church of Rome, asserting a purgatory, has not given sufficient cause for a separation, especially since she requires all to assent to it?

This point of purgatory is one of those which, in terms, we cannot well subscribe according to what is delivered in our Articles. But having separated all superstitions, abuses, and corruptions relating to this point, which are deservedly condemned, what remains seems a dispute about words, and, so far at least, according to our third rule, it ought not to be made the occasion of separating communion.²

¹ [Forbes, *Consid. Modest.* De Purg. cap. iii. 31, quoting De Dominis, *De Rep. Eccles.* v. 8.]

² ["Duo tantum ab Ecclesiâ de Purgatorio definita sunt, ejusdem scilicet existentia, et suffragiorum utilitas erga defunctorum animas."—Perrone, *Prælect. Theol.*, vol. i. p. 478.]

Now, I wish the thing were calmly considered, to see if something of this debate be not more of terms than of real difference. The reason I have is this,—I see great men in our Church hold a kind of third place, or a third state of souls. Bishop Montague asserts such a state of all the souls of the righteous before Christ's ascension, for he says positively they were not in heaven, strictly taken, not in that heaven which is now the receptacle of the righteous.¹ Many others maintain a state peculiar to the righteous, in which they wait till the day of judgment, and then are to receive the accomplishments of their happiness. Now this seems to own a third state, which is neither hell nor yet that heaven which is generally understood by that name. Now if there can be allowed a third state, the difference then cannot be very great.

It is true, here is no mention yet of punishment, and therefore but little resemblance with purgatory. But if we take in here what Bishop Forbes supposes in his discourse now mentioned, it will come something nearer. For in his third state (taught, as he says, in the primitive Church) he supposes the *guilt of lesser sins*, and likewise a *forgiveness* of such sins by the prayers of the Church. Now this cannot well be supposed to be any part of heaven, since "nothing that defileth" can enter there, and it is contrary to the general notion of heaven to think it capable of sin. Neither can it be hell, because there is no forgiveness. Must it not therefore be a state capable of

¹ Montague, *Appeal*, ch. xviii. p. 228.

sin, which is not heaven, and capable of forgiveness, which is not hell? And how far does this come short of purgatory? Especially since such souls, while under the guilt of those lesser sins in which they die, cannot be admitted to the vision of God, and consequently have the punishment of *privation*, which is of all the greatest, till by the intercession of the Church such guilt is remitted. Thus, by deduction, we are come to a third state, and even of punishment, as taught by Bishop Forbes from the authority of holy Fathers and Councils. Besides, the usual forms of wishing the dead peace, light, and refreshment, together with mercy, show a place or state of uneasiness. And even in our Litany, as the middle state is evident in the prayer for deliverance in the hour of death and in the day of judgment, insomuch that between death and the day of judgment there must be some state out of which we pray to be delivered at that great and last day, so the afflictive part is plainly implied in the word *deliver*, which is always from something disagreeable to us. If then we can go thus far in our communion, the Roman Church will here meet us. For though they generally speak of purgatory fire, yet, upon due inquiry, I find this fire is no more than the common opinion of their divines, but nowhere defined, as of faith, either in the Council of Florence or Trent, in both which purgatory is defined without mention of fire; nay, the Greeks opposed this opinion in the Council of Florence, as is related out of Bellarmine by Veron, and yet without any breach

of communion upon this account.¹ Hence, since this point of purgatory fire is only an opinion, and not imposed on any, according to our second rule it ought not to be insisted on ; and hence is a way made here which gives some hopes of peace.

QUEST. VI. Whether such a state or place as purgatory, being nowhere mentioned in Scripture, be not reason enough for ever to stand against it ?

Our Church has not undertaken to reform to the letter of the Scripture, but to the pure primitive Church of Christ, which is the best expositor of Scripture, and likewise the best witness of all that was taught by the Apostles. Hence our most eminent prelates express a reverence, and even submission, to what that primitive Church has delivered to us, though nowhere mentioned in Holy Writ. As Bishop Forbes, in this chapter about praying for the dead, Bishop Gunning, in his treatise of Lent, proving it to be apostolical, though nowhere expressed in Scripture ; and our whole Church has given authority to this in receiving the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, with all their contents, though nowhere mentioned in Scripture. Nay, the Gospel itself encourages it, while it assures us that all things are not written ; and St. Paul, in giving this charge to the Thessalonians : “Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle.”² Hence Bishop Montague asserting a

¹ Veron, *Reg. Fid.* ii. 4, De Purg. [The Council of Trent has simply defined, “Purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari.”—Sess. 25, De Purg.]

² 2 Thess. ii. 15.

third state of pious souls before Christ's ascension, and having put this objection, "There's no such place mentioned in Scripture," answers it thus: "Though there be no third place mentioned in Scripture, yet it would not follow hence that there was no such place, because there are many things which are not expressed in Scripture." Then as to the texts which seem to restrain the state of departed souls either to Hell or Heaven, he says: "This is to be understood of the final state of souls after the day of judgment, when there will be no more than two conditions of souls everlasting, viz. Heaven and Hell, and in this both Churches agree."¹ Hence, a third place or state being not expressed in Scripture ought not to be the cause of separation, especially if such a state is evidently consequent to what was taught by the primitive Church, as seems to be from what has been recited out of Bishop Forbes.

¹ Montague, *Apparat. ad Orig. Eccles.* i. 135 [p. 61, ed. 1635].

CHAPTER VIII.

Of Penances, Indulgences, and the Number of Sacraments.

QUEST. I. Whether penances are of good use and necessary, or fit to be enjoined for sins ?

Of this there needs be no dispute, since this ancient discipline is allowed and earnestly wished for in the Commination, which is to be read yearly on the first day of Lent. And I have heard that King Charles II. upon this occasion used to ask, with some wonder, who it was that hindered the restoring thereof.

QUEST. II. Whether indulgences are not abominable, which either give leave to sin or grant the pardon of past sins, and these obtained for a sum of money ?

This was the opinion I formerly had of indulgences ; but since I began to follow other measures besides taking upon trust, upon diligent examination, I have found that indulgences in the Church of Rome are neither pardons for sin nor leave to commit sin, but the same which has been practised in the purest ages of the Church, and that is a remission of some part of those canonical penances which were wont to be inflicted for some greater crimes. This power of bind-

ing and loosing we own in the Church, and retain it in our canons, and it is yet in force in respect of some crimes ; and Dr. Cave shows it to have been practised in the primitive Church.¹ The Church of Rome proposes no more in her definitions of faith than that the power of granting indulgences is given to the Church by Jesus Christ, and the use of them beneficial to the faithful.²

This is all that is proposed as a term of communion by that Church, which being according to the doctrine of our own, I do not see any reason to divide upon this account, especially since the Council of Trent, in its decree of indulgences, refers to antiquity, and to what has been established by ancient Synods, in which nothing more was taught besides the dispensing, upon due motives, with the rigour of discipline ; for by this it appears there is no other meaning of indulgences imposed upon any besides that which was primitive, and we still retain.

These indulgences having been formerly called pardons, I presume, has been the occasion of their having been reputed pardons for sins ; and whereas giving of alms has been generally one condition required for gaining such indulgences, hence has it been thought that the pardon of sin was offered for money. But upon inquiry I find these to be mistakes, for all books of doctrine in the Church of Rome unanimously teach that there is no pardon of sin without true repentance, and an humble confession of sin ; and

¹ Cave, *Primitive Christianity*, Part iii. c. 5 [pp. 459, 464, ed. 1702].

² *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 25, De Indulg.

if these do not precede, no indulgence can avail them in order to the pardon of their sin. In this I am certain we join, and they require no more for our joining with them, and therefore as to this point I see great hopes of an amicable accord.

QUEST. III. Whether the granting indulgences for many thousand years, and such as are found in many books, of many years' pardon, with the release of a soul out of purgatory, granted for saying one short prayer or wearing some medal, be not scandal enough to discourage all men of sense from joining with the Church of Rome ?

The canonical penances of the primitive Church, I observe, were for many years, whence it cannot be wondered if the tenor of indulgences, which are the release of such penalties, be for many years.¹ But as to the thousand years' pardons, with the rest now mentioned, there are none of these offered by any General Council, nor have place in any profession of faith, and therefore being not imposed on any, though never so corrupt, yet according to our second rule they are not to obstruct communion, since joining in communion with that Church does not oblige to consent to or approve any such practices. It being as common in that Church to disapprove the concession of indulgences for frivolous causes and some slight work, as by others that are out of it.

QUEST. IV. Whether the doctrine of indulgences was not that which obliged Luther to depart from the

¹ [It is so explained in Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the Catholic Church*, vol. ii. p. 83. See the whole lecture.]

Church and undertake a reformation? How then can the Reformation join with it?

By the best account of history, I find there had been great abuses in this point of indulgences, such as were not less injurious than provoking; so that I do not wonder at Luther in making a party against them, but think he had deserved the applause of the Christian world had he done it in a canonical way. But I find too he was not the only person that expressed a zeal against such corrupt practices. Pope Innocent II. had long before complained of them in the great Lateran Council [second Lateran, 1139], laying the intolerable abuses on the Questors or collectors in those days. Clement V. in the Council at Vienna, an. 1311, censures the evil practices of those times much more, and makes a severe order against the wicked ministers and under-officers of the inferior clergy, to whom the publishing of indulgences and collection of the people's alms for some public and pious uses was committed. He exposes their crime in undertaking, with much rashness and the delusion of souls, to grant indulgences, to release penances, and deceitfully to promise to those that gave them alms the release of three or four of their parents' or friends' souls out of purgatory; representing them as great liars and cheats, and then taking care to put an effectual stop to all such abuses. But this is best seen in the words of the constitution.

Having given this character of these Quæstores:
“Illos in suis prædicationibus simplices decipere, et aurum extorquere, in animarum periculum, et pluri-

morum scandalum," he then goes on thus : "*Cum aliqui ex hujusmodi Quæstoribus, sicut ad nostram audientiam est prelatum, non sine multa temeritatis audacia, deceptione multiplici animarum, indulgentias populo, motu suo proprio, de facto concedant ; super votis dispensent ; in perjurijs, homicidijs, et peccatis alijs sibi confitentes absolvant ; male ablata incerta (data sibi aliqua pecuniæ quantitate) remittant ; tertiam, aut quartam partem de pænitijs injunctis relaxent ; animas tres, vel plures parentum, vel amicorum illorum, qui eleemosynas eis conferunt, de Purgatorio (ut asserunt mendaciter) extrahant, et ad gaudia Paradisi perducant ; benefactoribus locorum, quorum Quæstores existunt, remissionem plenariam peccatorum indulgeant ; et aliqui ex ipsis, eos a pæna et a culpa (ut eorum verbis utamur) absolvant ; Nos abusus hujusmodi omnimode aboleri volentes, inhibemus."*¹

Here is confessed the origin of those extravagant indulgences above mentioned, and care taken for removing the grand abuses by which those trading Questors had imposed upon the people, and most scandalously enriched themselves. This care might probably have some effect ; but where covetousness had so great a prey the cure was not lasting. The like abuses returned again, and were those with which the Church was deformed in Luther's days. Now, had the Church of Rome undertaken to justify and defend such abuses, his arming the State against the Church might have had some colour. But although there did not appear that zeal for so timely a reforming

¹ *Clem. V. Decr. in Conc. Vienneus, L. v. tit. 9, cap. 2.*

them as the scandals seemed to require, yet as Clement had done before, so did the pastors of the Church afterwards, lament those corruptions and take more effectual care for their being removed and their return prevented.

For the Council of Trent, complaining of the fruitless endeavours of precedent Councils, quite abrogated this office of Questors, and in abhorrence of their scandals wholly abolished their name, with all the privileges belonging to them, and committed the publishing of such indulgences and collecting charities to the ordinary, with two of the chapter joined with him, to be done *nulla prorsus mercede accepta*.¹

And then for reforming all abuses see what decree it has made :—

“The holy synod desires that moderation be used in granting indulgences, according to the ancient and approved custom in the Church, lest by too much facility ecclesiastical discipline be weakened. And being solicitous that abuses which have crept in be reformed and corrected, which have given occasion to heretics of blaspheming the venerable name of indulgences ; it ordains in general, by this present decree, that all wicked lucre for obtaining them, which has been the cause of many great abuses amongst the faithful, be wholly abolished. And as for all other abuses, which are occasioned by superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or from what other cause soever, since they cannot be here in particular forbid, by reason of the manifold corruptions of places and pro-

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 21, De Reform., cap. 9.

vinces in which they are committed; therefore the synod strictly enjoins all bishops to take a particular list of such abuses in their respective dioceses, and give in a memorial of them to the first provincial synod; that being acknowledged by the sentence of other bishops, they may be forthwith laid before the Bishop of Rome, by whose authority and prudence may be ordained what may be expedient for the whole Church."¹

Thus stands this point of indulgences, which has been attended with great abuses. But since the Church of Rome maintains not such abuses, but joins with Luther and the rest of the Reformation in using means for their being removed, we ought not to make such abuses an exception against communion, but, according to our second rule, lay aside this question.

QUEST. V. Whether the number of seven sacraments in the Church of Rome be not a just exception against communion?

This seems a dispute principally about a term, and therefore, according to our third rule, not sufficient to obstruct communion. We all agree that a sacrament is a visible sign of inward and spiritual grace. Now, though the question be asked in our Church Catechism, "How many Sacraments has Christ ordained in His Church?" and the answer is thus made: "Two only, as generally necessary to salvation;" yet this does not exclude others from that name and designation though from the prerogative and degree; so that, although there be but two, *as generally*

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 25, cap. 21, De Indulg.

necessary to salvation, yet it is consistent with our Church's doctrine to allow of others not thus necessary but of an inferior prerogative and degree. This is Bishop Montague's exposition of this article in terms, where he quotes Calvin, acknowledging ordination to be a sacrament, "*Sacramentum esse concedo; sed inter ordinaria sacramenta non numero.*" Upon which Bishop Montague says this: "No Papist living, I think, will say or desire more. It is not for all, but for some."¹ Now if this will stand good in our Church, it will likewise stand in the Roman Communion, it being the very doctrine they teach, as may be seen in the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, where are these words: "*Illud vero maxime advertendum est, quamvis omnia sacramenta divinam et admirabilem virtutem in se contineant, tamen non parem omnia, et æqualem necessitatem, aut dignitatem, aut unam eandemque significandi vim habere,*"² which is the sense of the Bishop's words now given. Whence it may be hoped that this point may be accommodated, as having more difference in terms than in substance.³

¹ Montague, *Just Appeal*, ch. xxx. p. 305.

² *Cat. ad Parochos*, Pars ii. cap. i. Q. 16.

³ [It is well known that no precise definition of the number of the Sacraments was laid down for many centuries. There is, indeed, an intentional vagueness in the language of early Christian writers and Fathers on the whole subject of Sacraments, as Probst points out (*Sakramente und Sakramentalien*), on account of the *disciplina arcani*. Origen, however, as he shows (pp. 7 *sqq.*), refers to "other venerable and glorious Sacraments" beside Baptism, which are known to the initiated; and Tertullian, in different places, enumerates all of them except Unction of the Sick. Nor can there be any doubt that all were administered from the beginning in the Church, though it was left for a later age to mark out, by explicit and formal definition, the exclusive sacramental character of the seven ordinances to which special grace is attached by Divine institution. Peter Lombard,

in the twelfth century, was the first to specify the number in the Latin Church; but, as Bishop Forbes fully admits (*Explan. of Articles*, ii. 446), "the septenary number had long been held both by the Greek and Latin Churches, and there is no ground to deprive of a sacramental character the rites for which that character is claimed." The Reformers were undecided and divided on the subject. Luther admitted three, Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist, which are accordingly recognised in the Confession of Augsburg and the Apology. Cranmer also at one time admitted three, making Confirmation the third. Calvin would allow only two. The language of the Anglican Articles, to cite Bishop Forbes, "is awkward and embarrassed;" but the Church of England retained the use of the five Sacraments which it seems to disparage, first in their entirety, and afterwards with the curious omission of that one which has the most direct scriptural authority of any of them, though the traditional testimony, for reasons discussed by Probst (*Sakram.* pp. 373 *seqq.*), is not so copious. Bishop Forbes, however, justly observes that this defect of evidence "is replaced by the agreement of the Greeks, the Armenians, the Nestorians, and all the Orientals, with the Latins, on this subject; so that one cannot doubt that a sacramental use of anointing the sick has been from the beginning" (*Explan.* ii. 467). It was retained in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., but dropped in 1552. It may be added that the Synod of Bethlehem in 1672 defined for the Eastern Church, in accordance with the Tridentine doctrine, seven Sacraments (*μυστήρια*) of the Church. On the scriptural argument, see Döllinger's *First Age of the Church*, vol. ii. pp. 36 *seqq.* (3d ed.). Goethe has dwelt in eloquent language on the wonderful symbolism and completeness of the sacramental ritual of the Church, which accompanies man through all the successive stages of his earthly life, from the cradle to the grave. See also a striking passage in Froude's *Short Studies on Great Subjects* (first series, pp. 131, 132), from which two or three sentences may be given: "Like the seven lamps before the Throne of God, the seven mighty angels, and the seven stars, the seven Sacraments shed over mankind a never-ceasing stream of blessed influences. . . . Christ consecrates our birth; Christ throws over us our baptismal robe of pure unsullied innocence. He strengthens us as we go forward. He raises us when we fall. He feeds us with the substance of His own most precious Body. . . . He has taken away the sting of death, but its appearance is still terrible; and He will not leave us without special help at our last need. He tries the agony of the moment, and He sweetens the cup for us before we drink it. We are dismissed to the grave with our bodies anointed with oil, which He made holy in His last anointing before His Passion, and then all is over. We lie down and seem to decay—to decay—but not all."]

CHAPTER IX.

Of Confession, Repentance, and the Pardon of Sin.

QUEST. I. Whether it be not abominable sacrilege in the Church of Rome to go to men for the pardon of sin, whilst in so doing they forsake God for man?

Upon examination into this point, I find the Romanists believe as firmly as we do that there is no power but of God alone can forgive sins, and that where God has made men the ministers of His power, there to go to such his ministers is not to forsake God, or to seek any other power besides of God, but it is to comply with His ordinance, and consequently the direct way of seeking God, since doing His will is the most effectual way of going to Him. "He that hears you hears Me." Thus they; hence if any fix this upon them, of forsaking God, it is a consequence which they expressly disown, and therefore, according to our fourth rule, ought not to be pressed, so as to make this the cause of a breach between us, especially in a point in which the two Churches agree in so many particulars.

For, *first*, we allow of Confession. It is advised in the Exhortation giving warning of a Communion, and

more particularly a special confession is urged in the rubric at the Visitation of the Sick. But if not requisite, why is the dying person to be then alarmed and troubled therewith, when least capable to reflect upon his past life? Hear Bishop Montague: "Private confession unto a Priest is of very ancient practice in the Church, of excellent use and benefit, being discreetly handled. We refuse it to none, if men require it, if need be to have it; we urge and persuade it *in extremis*. We require it in the case of perplexity, for the quieting of men disturbed and their consciences."¹

Secondly, We approve of absolution, and use the very same form as the Church of Rome. "By His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins." And though many with us own this sentence to be no more than *declarative*, yet in our Church it is held to be *absolute* and *judiciary*, as by Dr. Comber, in his Exposition of the Common Prayer, and others. At least we own the power of the keys, as Bishop Andrewes in his prayer: "Giving me good hopes of the remission of my sins, by repentance, and by the good works thereof, through the power of the most holy keys and Sacraments in Thy Church."²

Thirdly, The same learned prelate seems to plead even the necessity of making application to the priests of the Church. In his Court Sermon, on Job xx. 23 (*Quorum remisieritis peccata*), "We are not," says he, "the ordinance of God thus standing, to rend off one

¹ Montague, *Just Appeal*, ch. xxxii. p. 299.

² *Manual of Private Devotion*. [*Minor Works, Anglo-Cath. Lib.* p. 317.]

part of the sentence. Three are here expressed, three persons: 1. The person of the sinner in *quorum*; 2. Of God, in *remittantur*; 3. Of the priest, in *remiseritis*. Three are expressed, and where three are expressed three are required, and where three are required two are not enough. It is St. Augustine that thus speaketh of this ecclesiastical act in his time, '*Nemo sibi dicat*,' etc. Let nobody say within himself, I repent in private, I repent before God. God, who pardons me, knows I repent from my heart. Then to no purpose was it said, Whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Then to no purpose were the keys given to the Church of God; we make void the Gospel, we make void the words of Christ." Thus this bishop, and then takes notice that in the ordination of priests are these very words: "*Quorum remiseritis peccata*,"—"Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven." And then he adds that God ordinarily proceedeth, in remitting sin, by the Church's act. And hence "they have their parts in this work, and cannot be excluded no more in this than in other acts and parts of their function. And to exclude them is (after a sort) to wring the keys out of their hands, to whom Christ hath given them; is to cancel and make void this clause of *remiseritis*, as if it were no part of the sentence; to account of all this solemn sending and inspiring as if it were an idle and fruitless ceremony."²

¹ [Andrewes's *Sermons*, vol. v. pp. 93, 94, *Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.* So Archbishop Wake at a later date: "We exhort men, if they have any the least doubt or scruple—nay, sometimes though they have none—but especially before they receive the Holy Sacrament, to confess their sins. We

Now, this being a doctrine so much approved, and there being an agreement in so many particulars, there seems reason to hope that means may be found to accommodate this point between the two Churches.

QUEST. II. Whether it be not impossible to close with a Church which requires no repentance for the pardon of sin, but running to a priest and confessing, which is enough for the worst of crimes, and encourages penitents to believe all well though immediately they return to the vomit, repeating the same wickedness which they had but just confessed ?

None that are serious in Christianity can close with such doctrine, for it is certainly abominable. As to matter of fact, I cannot say how far this may be the practice of hardened sinners. But as to manner of doctrine, I can positively say this is not the doctrine of the Church of Rome. For having examined both their Councils, public catechisms, prayer-books, and other practical treatises, I find the point of repentance is as strictly pressed, and a true conversion with amendment of life declared as necessary for the pardon of sin, by them in that Church as it is or can be with us. For this I produce the Council of Trent, where (it being declared that contrition is the first act which belongs to a penitent who desires to make his peace with God) contrition is thus described : “ *Contritio animi dolor ac detestatio est de peccato commisso, cum proposito non peccandi*

propose to them the benefit not only of ghostly advice, how to manage their repentance, but of absolution too, as soon as they shall have completed it.”]

de cætero," etc.,—"Contrition is a grief and detestation of the mind for sin committed, with a purpose of sinning no more. Now this contrition has been at all times necessary for obtaining pardon of sin; and in a man falling after baptism, it so prepares for the remission of sin, if it be joined with a confidence in the divine mercy, and a desire of performing what other things are required for this sacrament. Wherefore, the holy Synod declares that contrition does not only comprehend a ceasing from sin, with the purpose and beginning of a new life, but likewise a hatred of the old, according to that of the prophet, 'Cast away from you all your iniquities, in which you have prevaricated, and make to yourselves a new heart and a new spirit.' For, certainly, whoever considers those cries of the saints: 'To Thee only have I sinned and have done evil before Thee: I have laboured with groaning: I will every night water my bed with tears: I will call over my past years in the bitterness of my soul;' with others like, will easily perceive that a vehement hatred of the past life and great abhorrence of sin has been the spring from whence they flowed." "It declares likewise that imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, because it commonly arises either from the consideration of the foulness of sin, or from the fear of punishment (*si voluntatem peccandi excludat, cum spe veniæ*), if it turns the will from sin with the hopes of mercy, does not make a man a hypocrite and greater sinner, but is the gift of God [and impulse of the Holy Ghost, not yet inhabiting but only moving the penitent, that he may

return to righteousness.”]¹ And again, as to imposing penances, the Council gives this direction : “ Let priests be mindful that the penance they prescribe be not only for being faithful in a new life, and the cure of weakness, but also for the revenge and punishment of past sins.”²

The same doctrine is repeated at large in the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, in which the people are to be instructed, and where these particulars are inculcated : 1. That contrition for sin ought to be a grief of all the greatest ; because sins turn the heart from God, and therefore are above all things to be detested ; and this proved from several reasons. 2. That the penitent ought to detest not only some, but all his sins ; expressed thus : “ *Primum necesse est, peccata omnia, quæ admissimus, odisse et dolere.*” It is declared to be necessary, 3. That the penitent ought to engage in a firm and stable resolution of amending his life : and this pressed from many texts of Scripture, to show that it is what is expressly required by God Himself, and a condition necessary to be observed ; with much more at length.³

This is the general tenor of all their books which give directions for repentance and confession, and it being a point of greatest concern, and in which I had a great mind to be perfectly satisfied, I therefore examined all the books I could hear of, composed in several nations, for the use of the people, which have been made English : as Rodericus (Rodriguez), a

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 14, De Pœnit. cap. 4.

² *Ibid.* cap. 8.

³ *Cat. ad Par.*, Pars ii. cap. v. Q. 23 et sqq.

Spaniard ; Segneri, an Italian ; the Spiritual Director, a Frenchman ; besides others of our own nation. And in this they all with one voice concur : That a sincere repentance is absolutely necessary for the pardon of sin, and that no confession is to any purpose if it be not accompanied with a real detestation of sin, and a sincere resolution of a new life.¹ The book last mentioned may serve for all to give satisfaction in this point (chaps. xv. xvi.), where this doctrine is delivered : That confession can be to no purpose if it be not accompanied with certain interior dispositions set down in the Scripture. The first is a sincere regret and compunction for the sins we confess. The second is a firm resolution to correct and amend them. "It is plain," says he, "these two dispositions are of absolute necessity, for it is impossible that God shall pardon a sin which the sinner does not detest. So long as the love of our sins remains in us, so long likewise does the guilt, nor can all the confessing in the world discharge us of it."

Now, this being the professed doctrine of the Church of Rome, the corrupt practices of hypocrites, or sinners, or the opinions of some schoolmen, ought not to be made an objection against communion, according to our second rule, since communicating

¹ ["The Catholic Church believes that the institution left by our Saviour (for the cancelling of sins through the application of His all-redeeming and all-sufficient Blood) was [not Confession but] the Sacrament of Penance, consisting of three parts, whereof Confession is only one, and that one not the most essential," contrition and satisfaction being explained to be the other two.—Wiseman's *Lectures on the Catholic Church*, vol. ii. pp. 8, 9, ed. 1844.]

with the Church requires no communication, but rather a detestation of such evil practices.

QUEST. III. Whether the doctrine of a deathbed repentance, in the Church of Rome, be not abominable, which is such an encouragement to a sinful life, and affords such assurance upon the uncertainty of what is done at the last moment?

I have spared no labour necessary for a true information in this point, and upon inquiry have certainly found that the Church of Rome, both in practice and doctrine, joins with us. It is true, if any sinner at the last hour makes profession or gives signs of repentance, they refuse not absolution, because they know not the heart; and therefore, in the hour of distress, hoping the best, they let charity direct them in favour of the penitent.

But while they act thus charitably with dying persons, yet they discourage all from depending on such repentance; they show the danger of delays in turning to God; they show the uncertainty of all that is done on a deathbed; and this so fully that we cannot say more on this subject than what is delivered in their family books. See this in the *Christian Directory* (part ii. c. 7), where are employed no less than fifty pages to show the danger of delaying repentance, and of the great uncertainty of whatever is done at the last hour of sinners. The same is pressed in a smaller volume, *A Contrite and Humble Heart*, where one principal head is the "Danger of Delay;" and in twenty pages is said enough to discourage any sinner from the confidence of what is to be done on a

deathbed. But I need not appeal to private authors when the Council of Trent declares the difficulty of a new life, which belongs to confession, to be so great that none can have hopes of coming to it "*sine magnis nostris fletibus et laboribus*,"—"without earnest tears and great labour." And in another place, That the whole life of a Christian ought to be a life of penance. For while this is required, the encouragement is but very little to those who begin at the last hour, when persons are generally disabled and made unfit for doing anything.

Whatever therefore be the practical abuses, it is certain the doctrine of that Church is very sound as to what belongs to repentance; and therefore, according to our second rule, these questions ought to be no occasion of separate communion.¹

¹ [Döllinger observes that "the need for some institution securing to the clergyman the opportunity of acting directly on the conscience of the individual Christian is keenly felt in every Church," and that, while in the Anglican Church confession is retained, "in the German Protestant Church there is a very widely-spread desire to replace the general confession, which has become unmeaning and mechanical, by something much more like the Catholic form."—*Lect. on Reunion of the Churches*, p. 150.]

CHAPTER X.

Of Merit, Satisfaction, Works of Supererogation, and Relics.

QUEST. I. Whether it be not a damnable presumption in the Romanists to trust in their own merits, and so to confide in the value of their own works, as to demand heaven as their due?

This doctrine of merit sounds very ill, but upon a full inquiry the dispute seems to be more about words than any real difference between the two Churches. For what the Church of Rome means by merit is no more than this, that God gives grace to do many good works to which he has promised a reward, as may be seen at length in the Council of Trent,¹ where are brought proof of Scripture to show the promises God has made to such as persevere to the end in working righteousness and keeping His commandments.

Now, as to the very power by which any is enabled to do good, they declare also there as we do, that it is all from the grace of God, through Jesus Christ, which goes before, accompanies, and follows every good work, and without which nothing can find acceptance with

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 6, cap. 15.

God. And when they have done all they can do through the Divine grace, they say again, as we do, that they are not to glory nor confide in themselves, but in the pure mercy of God. Hear how the Council of Trent expresses it :—

“ Although the holy Scripture promises eternal rewards to those that do good, ‘*absit tamen, ut Christianus homo in seipso vel confidat, vel glorietur, et non in Domino,*’ etc., nevertheless, far be it from a Christian to confide or glory in himself and not in our Lord, whose goodness is so great towards all men that He will have that to be their merits which is His own gift. And because in many things we all offend, therefore every one, as he considers the mercy and goodness of God, so he ought likewise to have before his eyes His severity and judgment, and not make a full judgment of himself, even although he be not conscious to himself of any guilt ; because the whole life of man is to be examined and judged, not by the judgment of men, but of God, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and manifest the secrets of hearts.”¹ After this declaration the censure is there added :—“ If any one shall say that the just, for those good works which are done in God, ought not to expect and hope for an eternal recompence from God through His mercy and the merit of Jesus Christ, if he perseveres to the end, doing well, and keeping the divine law, let him be anathema.”²

This is the sense of that Church. And hence, since they teach that they can do no good but through the

¹ *Conc. Trid., ut supra.*

² *Ibid.* can. 26.

grace of God ; that the reward which God promises is the effect of His goodness and bounty ; that nothing can be accepted but through Christ ; and that when they have done all they can, they are still to go on in the fear of God's judgments ; let us consider that all this is also the doctrine of our Church. And while we agree in the substance of our doctrine, the term of merit which they use ought not, according to our third rule, [to] make a difference between us.

If farther satisfaction be required in this point, it may be had in Rodriguez, where he declares that it is an article of faith, that we have nothing of our own stock but sin, and that we hold all the rest from God's bounty, to whom ought to be ascribed the glory of all we have received, and not to ourselves but to God alone, the Author and Dispenser of all good ; that we can do nothing of ourselves when separated from the true vine, who is Christ Jesus ; that of ourselves we are good for nothing but as dead branches to be burnt, and if we are anything, "it is by the grace of God that we are what we are." Hence we are not to impute anything to ourselves, nor rely any way upon our own strength, but ascribe all to God. And as life and motion are not to be attributed to the body, but to the soul that animates it, so the soul must not ascribe to itself the good actions it does, but to God alone, who quickens it by His grace, and gives it the means to perform them. We must have a continual diffidence of ourselves and an entire confidence in God. And when we have done all that depends on us, we are obliged to confide no more therein than as if we

had done nothing ; we must look upon ourselves as unprofitable servants, and put our confidence in God alone, according to these words of our Saviour : When ye have done all that is commanded ye, say still ye are unprofitable servants.¹ Thus is this doctrine taught and repeated by a Jesuit, whose works are in all languages for the instruction of all. The same is taught, in short, in the *Following of Christ*, which is in the hands of all : “ And when he has done all that he knows to be done, let him think he has done nothing. Let him not weigh that much which might be much esteemed, but according to truth let him affirm himself to be an unprofitable servant, as our Saviour has said.”² Here the doctrine appears the same we teach, and therefore the difference of terms ought not to separate communions.

QUEST. II. Whether it be not a doctrine of great presumption in the Church of Rome, and very injurious to the Passion of Christ, to teach people that by their own works they may make satisfaction for their sins, by which they have provoked God’s anger against them ?

This seems to be another dispute, like the former, about a term. For having made inquiry into this point, I find that though this be a common way of speaking among their authors, yet they mean no more than what we may approve ; and that they expressly disown all things in this doctrine which can be injurious to Christ. Hear how the Council of Trent declares it :—

¹ Rodriguez, *Christian Perfection*, Of Humility, ch. 30-32.

² *De Imitat.*, ii. 11.

“Neither has there been any other way judged more secure in the Church of God for turning away the Divine chastisements, than for men to be assiduous in performing those works of penance with a true grief of mind. Moreover, while by making satisfaction we suffer for our sins, we are conformed to Christ Jesus, who satisfied for our sins, and from whom is all our sufficiency; whence also we have a certain pledge, that if we suffer with Him, we shall be glorified with Him. Neither is this satisfaction we perform for our sins so ours that it is not through Jesus Christ. For we, who of ourselves, as of ourselves, can do nothing, are able to do all things through Him, who works together with us, and strengthens us. Whence man has nothing wherein to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we satisfy; bringing forth worthy fruits of penance, which have their efficacy from Him, which are offered by Him to the Father, and through Him are accepted by the Father.”¹ And by these satisfactions, no Catholic ever yet thought that the efficacy of the merit and satisfaction of our Lord Jesus Christ was either blemished or any way lessened.

Thus the Council speaks of satisfaction; and while they derive all from Christ, and confess with us that they can do nothing of themselves, and that whatever acceptance their penitential works find with God, it is not from anything they do, but only and wholly through the merit and passion of Christ, it seems to be a doctrine little different from us, except only in

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 14, cap. 8.

terms, which, according to our third rule, ought to make no difference of communion. And if the doctrine be different, yet since they disown whatever can be injurious to the Passion of Christ, this consequence, according to our fourth rule, ought not to be pressed upon them, so as to become the occasion or warrant for justifying a separation.

QUEST. III. Whether it does not betray an intolerable pride and confidence in the Romanists to think they can do more than God requires at their hands, and more than is necessary, which they call “works of supererogation”?

I have carefully weighed their profession of faith, and find not so much as a hint of this doctrine, neither can I see any footstep of it in the Council of Trent; whence I have reason to judge it to be no more than a school opinion, which, according to our first rule, ought not to make a difference of communion: or, at least, is not imposed on any, and therefore, by our second rule, is to be laid aside. Though, if I apprehend it aright, it means no more than we may approve, that is, the performance of such good works which God has not required of us by any precept, such as it was in Mary Magdalen, when, falling at the feet of Jesus in the Pharisee’s house, she anointed them with ointment, having first washed them with her tears and wiped them with her hair. Repentance and love of Christ was commanded, but this her manner of expressing it, so acceptable to Jesus, was not commanded, and hence it is termed by them a work of supererogation; and if no more be meant by it, the difference

can be only about a term, which, according to our third rule, ought not to make a difference.¹

QUEST. IV. Whether the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome as to relics be not abominable, while they place so much confidence in them, and abuse the world with so many counterfeit and ridiculous things for the relics of Saints ?

Their profession of faith says no more than "*Reliquias esse venerandas*,"—"That the relics of Saints are to be venerated." And while they expound and declare this to be no more than what is given to other holy things, as to the sacred vessels, etc., it seems not contrary to the doctrine of our Church, which allows a veneration to holy things, and therefore may give hopes of being so compounded as to make no occasion of a separate communion.

But now, as to all abuses and ridiculous impostures in this point, the Church of Rome requires no approbation of them. Rather, I see, she has joined with the Reformation in expressing her dislike against them, and given strict charge to her pastors to be watchful in removing all such superstitions and abuses. This she has done in the Council of Trent, where, having made several decrees concerning the images of Christ and of holy relics, is added this general order : "*In has autem sanctas et salutares observationes si qui abusus irrepserint, eos prorsus aboleri sancta synodus vehementer cupit.*" "If any abuses have crept into

¹ [Dupin explained to Archbishop Wake that "works of supererogation mean only works conducive to salvation, which are not matter of strict precept, but of counsel only." See Maclaine's Transl. of Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. v. p. 130.]

these holy and wholesome observations, the Synod most earnestly desires they should be wholly abolished." Again, more expressly: "*Omnis porro superstitio in sanctorum invocatione, reliquiarum veneratione, et imaginum sacro usu tollatur, omnis turpis quæstus eliminetur.*" "Moreover, let all kind of superstition in the invocation of saints, in the veneration of relics, in the sacred use of images, be taken away, and all filthy lucre be rooted out." Then follows a decree: "*Hæc ut fidelius observentur, statuit Sancta Synodus, nulla admittenda esse nova miracula, nec novas reliquias recipiendas, nisi recognoscente et approbante episcopo, qui simul atque de iis aliquid compertum habuerit, adhibitis in consilium theologis, et aliis piis viris, ea faciat, quæ veritati, et pietati consentanea judicaverit.*" "That those things may be more faithfully observed, the Holy Synod decrees that no new miracles are to be admitted, nor any new relics to be received, but with the examination and approbation of the bishop, who having found anything certain in them, let him consult with divines and other pious men, and then do what he shall judge agreeable to truth and piety."¹

In this manner does that Church express itself in this point, so that as to opposing and rooting out all superstition and abuses in this matter the two Churches agree, while both are for the reformation of them. And yet if there be such abuses still remaining unreformed, as long as they are not imposed on any by that Church, this ought not to be the occasion of any breach between us, according to our second rule.

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 25, De Invoc. Sanct.

CHAPTER XI.

Of breeding People in Ignorance, of Praying in an Unknown Tongue, and forbidding the Bible in the vulgar Tongue.

QUEST. I. Must not the communion with the Roman Church be unlawful, which professedly breeds up her people in ignorance, hides from them the knowledge of their greatest duties, and preaches to them in an unknown tongue?

I have taken a full information of this point, and have found upon due inquiry that the Church of Rome is both desirous and solicitous that all in her communion should be duly instructed in all duties which belong to salvation, especially in the Commandments, in the Creed, in the Sacraments, in the Lord's Prayer, and such other obligations which the Gospel lays upon all believers.

This is what the Church requires, and accordingly the Council of Trent commands all bishops that sermons be preached to the people, both in their cathedrals and in parish churches, on all Sundays and solemn festivals; that in Lent and Advent the Word of God and the Divine Law be preached every day, or at least



thrice a week, if they shall judge it convenient; that the people be admonished of their obligation of going to their parish church to hear the Word of God. The bishops are likewise to see that, on Sundays and holidays, the children be duly instructed in all parishes in the principles of the Christian Doctrine, and taught obedience both to God and their parents, and if need be, even are to make use of ecclesiastical censures for having this done effectually.¹ Now, as to all preaching and catechizing, it is the constant practice of that Church to do this in the vulgar tongue of each respective nation, that so the people may receive the benefit of what is said.

'Tis true the common form of administering the sacraments in that Church is in Latin, but then it takes care that the people be not ignorant of anything that is done in administration of those mysteries. For this end the said Council of Trent has given strict order to all bishops, that whether they themselves or the parish priests administer the sacraments, due care be used to expound to the people, in the vulgar tongue, according to their capacity, the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, as it shall be found necessary for their approaching to those holy ordinances with greater devotion and reverence; and this according to the form of the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, which the bishops shall order to be translated into the vulgar languages, and by all parish priests be expounded to the people.² It likewise orders that, in time of Mass,

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 24, De Reform. cap. 4.

² *Ibid.* cap. 7.

on all holy-days, etc., the Word of God and the duties of salvation be explained to the people in the vulgar tongue, and that the parish priests, avoiding all unprofitable questions, be industrious to imprint the said duties in the hearts of all, and make them knowing in the law of our Lord. The same is strictly enjoined by the said Council.¹

It being thus in terms enjoined by the Council of Trent, I think as to this point of order and discipline we cannot disagree with this Church, or desire any better rules to be prescribed for the instruction of the flock. But if these orders are not in all places so duly executed as they ought, yet this, according to our second rule, ought not to be the occasion of a separate communion.

QUEST. II. Whether it be not an insufferable injury to the people in the Church of Rome to have the common and daily service of the Church (which they call the Mass) performed in Latin, which they do not understand? What is this but to be at prayers like so many statues without sense or understanding?

This is only a matter of discipline, and therefore subject to alteration, as shall be judged convenient for the public good. Hence there may be hopes of peace as to this, since, if we cannot approve it as it is for peace' sake, the other side, upon the motive of a public good, may be prevailed on to allow of a change, as was done in favour of the new Church in China, when leave was granted for the Missal to be translated and used in the vulgar language of the Chinese, though

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 5, cap. 2.

afterwards it was not found necessary to be made use of, as it is related by P. le Comte in his *Memoirs of China*. (Let. to F. la Chaize.) And I have read that the Pope offered the same to Queen Elizabeth.

However, to make way for a right understanding in this affair as to the present practice of the Church of Rome. Though, I must confess, it looks very surprising to see the public service in Latin, yet, upon examination, I find this is not particular to the Latins to have the Liturgy not in the vulgar tongue. For in this many other Christian Churches do the same, which upon the peoples changing their language, keep still their Liturgy in the ancient tongue, now scarce known to the people; as in the Greek Church, who have their public service in the ancient and pure Greek, which is so very different from the vulgar Greek now used by the people that they understand but little of it. So amongst the Maronites, Cophthites, Jacobites, Melchites, and Georgians, divine service is celebrated in the Chaldee or Syriac; whilst the vulgar language to all these is the Arabic, or to the more Easterly the Persian. However, while the public service amongst the Romanists is in a tongue not vulgar, yet I find the people are not kept in ignorance of what is done, for the French have the whole Missal translated into their own language, by which they see and understand all that is done at the altar. We have likewise several books in English which contain the service of that Church, and explain all that is performed, with Latin in one column and English in the other, by which the people are enabled to accompany the priest both in

spirit and understanding, and know when to answer Amen.¹ Again, upon inquiry I find the Mass is not a *form of prayer* like our Liturgy, but it is an *action or offering* in which the benefit of the congregation does not so much consist in *understanding the words* as in *knowing what is done*, which the most ignorant, and those that cannot read, are capable of, with a little care and instruction, for this they are taught by the eye; and hence, if they are but in sight of the priest, they know how to accompany him through the whole service, though they hear not one word of what is said, because actions are known by seeing, as words are by hearing. This may look strange to such as are accustomed to a form of prayer only; but if it be matter of fact, the truth of it may be easily found. And if it be so found, then there may be hopes of this being no longer made an occasion of separation, since the concern is of the people so understanding the service of the Church, as to assist at it with understanding and devotion. If this be, then the reasons of the Church of Rome will have some strength in them which plead for the Mass in Latin, that so, as the Church and its faith are one, so its worship, as much as may be, be one; that it be not subject to alteration as it would be in vulgar languages; that the ministers of the altar, changing residence and nation, may still be able to officiate and serve the people; and the faithful, leaving their country or travelling, may still find the divine service the same abroad as at home.

¹ The Roman Missal has been lately translated into English. Ed. Lond.
[It need hardly be said that all prayer-books in common use among Catholics contain a vernacular rendering of the Ordinary of the Mass.]

This as to the Mass; for as to family and private devotions, I find it is in the Church of Rome the same as with us; all have their prayer-books in their own language, and hence are provided with means for performing all exercises of devotion that can be helpful to salvation. Whence this point being summed up, that in the Church of Rome the people have all their prayer-books in their own language, and even the Mass too, the difference does not seem so very great, but by a condescendence on one side or other (and it is in a yielding matter, to wit, of discipline) there may be hopes of an accommodation.

QUEST. III. Whether it be not abominable in the Church of Rome to forbid the use of the Bible, and thus to deprive the people of the food of life?

Upon examination, I find the Council of Trent has given strict orders for establishing lectures and expositions of holy writ in collegiate churches, so as to empower the bishops to compel to it by forfeitures; as likewise in all monasteries and colleges, giving encouragement to all masters and scholars who shall apply themselves to this study. And the reason it gives for this decree is, "*Ne cœlestis ille Sacrorum Librorum thesaurus, quem Spiritus Sanctus, summa liberalitate, hominibus tradidit, neglectus jaceat.*" "That so that heavenly treasure of Holy Scripture, with which the Holy Ghost, in His infinite bounty, has provided us, may not lie neglected."¹

Again, I find the same Council has made a decree, "That nobody relying on their own private judgment

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 5, De Reform. cap. 1.

presume to wrest the Holy Scriptures, in matters of faith or manners, to their own private sense, contrary to that sense which the holy Church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense of Scripture, or contrary to the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers."¹

But I nowhere find in the whole Council that the Scripture is forbid in the vulgar tongue, nor that there is any danger of reading it. This is only one rule belonging to the *Index Expurgatorius*, bound up with the said Council, but no part of the Council, nor ever approved by it, but published by Pope Pius IV., and seems modestly composed, in referring this matter to the bishops and parish priests, to restrain those only from reading the Bible in the vulgar tongue whom they see so self-conceited or rash as to be in danger of wresting it to their own destruction.

Now as to the rule of interpreting Scripture here prescribed, according to the sense of the Church and the consent of the primitive Fathers, it is what is approved in our Church, and we have reason to wish it had been better observed.² And though we have no such restraint as here mentioned, yet while it falls only on the self-conceited and rash, I hope this will be no occasion of difference between the Churches. And if it be insisted on, it is soon removed, since the communion of that Church obliges not to the observance of the rule mentioned ; as matter of fact demonstrates

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 4, De Edit. et usu Sacr. Lib.

² [There is an Anglican canon of 1571, directing preachers to teach that doctrine only which "the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected out of the Old and New Testament."]

in the whole Gallican Church, which is abundantly provided with several versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue, and the liberty of reading it. There is also an English translation of the Holy Bible, made and printed by the Roman Catholics at Douay and Rheims. Whence it is evident reading the Scripture in the vulgar tongue is allowed in that Church, and consequently the restraint mentioned can be no sufficient exception, according to our second rule, against communicating with it.

CHAPTER XII.

Of Tradition, Miracles, Implicit Faith, and Uncharitableness.

QUEST. I. Whether it be not a great cheat to impose tradition upon the world for the doctrine of Christ and the word of God ?

The profession of faith obliges all in communion with the Church of Rome to receive traditions ; but what traditions are these ? Only Apostolical and Ecclesiastical traditions ; for so it is expressed in the said profession. And what is meant by these is expounded in the Council of Trent, viz., such doctrines as were delivered by the Apostles, without being committed to writing, and being preserved by the Church in all ages, have been delivered down to our days.¹ So that by this article no more is required but what we already agree to, that is, to receive whatever has been taught by the Apostles.

Hence in that Church is liberty of renouncing all vain and superstitious traditions of men ; and no submission required, but in such particulars which have a very full and sufficient testimony of having been

¹ *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. 4, De Canon. Script.

received from the Apostles and purest ages of the Church. In this principle I know of no disagreement. And though there be not that accord as to what these particulars are, yet here are good grounds for an accommodation, while both sides agree upon receiving whatever is warranted by the practice of the primitive Church. Some of ours reckon up some of these unwritten traditions, as Bishop Montague names Infant Baptism, and receiving in both kinds, and then adds: "There are six hundred particulars of this kind which have been instituted by God in the point of religion, commanded and used by the Church, of which we own that the Scripture delivers, or teaches, no such things."¹ We have others who come to more particulars; as the number of canonical books,² the Apostles' Creed, the Fast of Lent, the Lord's Day, the great festivals of Easter and Whitsunday, of not fasting on Sundays, of adoring towards the East, prostration before the altar, of signing the baptized with the cross, of receiving the Eucharist fasting; these are acknowledged to be primitive, and even that it is in the power of the Church to ordain such rites and ceremonies, which, if it can be conceded, will be a means of healing all the breach in this point.

QUEST. II. Whether the romantic legends and counterfeit miracles in the Church of Rome are not proof against it of its grand design being to deceive and impose upon the world?

This point may be easily compounded, especially,

¹ Montague's *Orig. Eccles.* [Tom. i. Pars 2], p. 396 [ed. 1640].

² [As also their *inspiration*, which rests on tradition.]

since the Church of Rome seems to join with the Reformation as to the particulars mentioned. The legends have been corrected long ago by Baronius and Ribadeneira;¹ and for preventing all fraud, Veron declares the legends to contain several things prejudicial to truth; and that now being corrected, there may still remain something uncertain or false; that they are only of human authority; and therefore no other credit need be given to them than to other profane history.² Now while this is declared, the occasion of deceit seems to be taken away, as likewise the question, by our second rule, since that Church imposes on none the belief of such relations, and there is the same liberty of questioning them within that communion as without.

It is much the same as to miracles: The Church of Rome raises a jealousy of them, and provides against imposture, as has been already hinted (Chap. x.) about relics, where the Council of Trent gives order that no miracles are to be admitted but what are examined and approved by the bishop, in consult with divines and other pious men. Thus she undertakes to reform past disorders, and so far joins with us. And as for whatever miracles are approved, yet since she imposes not the belief of them on any of her communion, but leaves them at liberty to examine and give credit

¹ The learned Jesuits at Antwerp, Bollandus and his continuators, have lately given the *Acta Sanctorum*, enriched with curious remarks and dissertations. And the Rev. Alban Butler has still later written *The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and other principal Saints*, from authentic Records, with Remarks critical and historical, in 12 vols. 2d ed. 1779.

² Veron, *Reg. Fid.*, c. 2, 20.

according as they see grounds, hence, according to our second rule, this point ought not to make a difference between us.

QUEST. III. Whether leading people on with an implicit faith and blindfold be not unworthy of the Christian profession, and of that rational faculty which God has given us ?

That article of our Christian faith, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," shows that we should be always in readiness to submit ourselves to the judgment of the Catholic Church. But otherwise I find not an implicit faith in any public profession or in any Council. Hence I look upon the common dispute about it as a school debate, which, according to our first rule, ought not to be made an occasion of difference. Secondly, I find that it is the rule of that Church to admit none into their communion but such as make an explicit profession of faith, after a due information of every point, except in some cases of necessity, when this cannot be done. Thirdly, I find, according to what has been declared (Chap. XI.), that care is taken by the orders of that Church that all should be well instructed in the principles of religion and piety, and that the *Catechismus ad Parochos* should be not only translated into the vulgar tongues, but likewise constantly expounded to the people; which said Catechism comprehends all matters both of controversy, piety, and morality. Now this being in order to an explicit faith and knowledge of all that belongs to a Christian life, I think there is an agreement in this point, and if any take other methods of

ignorance and blindness, it is not what that Church encourages, and therefore, according to our second rule, ought not to be made the occasion of any difference.

QUEST. IV. Whether the uncharitableness of the Church of Rome, which damns all that are not of her communion, be not enough to abhor the communion of the Church ?

Upon examination into this point, I find that in the close of the Profession of Faith, which all promoted to dignities in the Church of Rome are obliged to make, are these words : "*Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam profiteor.*" "This true Catholic faith, out of which nobody can be saved, and which I now profess." But so it is also in the Creed of Athanasius, which we say thirteen times a year. Besides, what are the contents of this profession ? In the first place, there is the Nicene Creed at length, which we too use very often, and then are added the Tridentine articles. Now, while the whole Creed is part of this faith, it may very well bear the foresaid close, "That out of this faith none can be saved." For this is what we consent to, though we approve not of the other articles that follow. I know some of the Roman Church carry this saying so far as to suppose all damned that are out of their Church. And yet others in the same communion judge more favourably of such as are invincibly ignorant of theirs being the true Church. This I have seen in an approved catechism, where the question being put, "What is to be thought of those who, being invincibly ignorant of the true Church, live a moral good life ?"

it is answered thus: "We must not be forward in condemning such, but leave them to the Divine mercy, of which they seem not altogether unworthy." Thus they differ in opinion; and therefore, since the uncharitableness mentioned in the question is nowhere proposed as a point of faith in the Roman Church, nor imposed on such as are admitted to her communion; hence I judge it not to be of faith, but only of opinion, and consequently, according to our first rule, ought not to make a breach between us.

Especially since no more is meant but what St. Paul declares, that heresies and schisms are works of the flesh, which exclude from the kingdom of heaven; and is little more than what is declared in our Church, particularly by a considerable person, who has published this assertion, "That God has made no covenant of mercy, but to those only who are in the Church; and that, as for those who are without, we must leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of God, which, what they are, or how far they will extend, we know not."¹ And what more is it than we say of them in our book of Homilies, where, in the third part of that against idolatry, it is declared, "That bishops and people, the laity and clergy, of whole Christendom (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more." This comes but little short of what they

¹ [Leslie's *Regale and Pontif.*, Works, ed. 1832, vol. iii. pp. 434, 435. Cf. remarks on this subject in Introduction, pp. 73, *sqq.*]

say against us. And therefore when both sides consider to what height things have been carried, I hope they will find it more according to charity to compound the matter than inflame the difference by such charges as these are.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of leaving out one of the Commandments, of not keeping Faith with Heretics, and of doing Evil that Good may come of it.

QUEST. I. Whether it be not most abominable in the Church of Rome to leave out one of the commandments, and thus hide part of the law of God from the people, and this only to conceal its errors ?

A short examination soon discovered to me the occasion of this question. For, upon perusing the catechisms commonly used in that Church, I found two sorts, one very short for children, the other longer for youth. The former sort is so short that none of the commandments that have any length are set down at length, as the second, third, fourth, and fifth. Nay, sometimes all of our second is quite left out, being, as they say, only an explication of the first. But in the other sort of catechisms, which are also in the hands of the people, the second commandment, with the rest, is set down full and entire.¹ Hence it

¹ [The simple fact is that the *arrangement* is different, the first and second commandments in the Protestant version forming one in the Catholic, and the tenth Protestant being divided into two.]

is plain the leaving out of the second commandment is no order of the Church requiring it to be so done ; but the two tables of the law are had in that communion as full as in ours ; and consequently, whatever be the censure of the shorter catechisms, yet, according to our second rule, this ought to be no occasion of difference, since that Church nowhere imposes those catechisms, but gives to all the liberty of the others.

QUEST. II. Whether it be not a detestable principle in the Church of Rome not to keep faith with heretics ?

Upon due inquiry into this point, I find the doctrine of divines in the Church of Rome as to this is the same with ours. They all with one voice agree that all lawful oaths and engagements are to be kept, whatever the person be to whom they are made, without any regard to their religion ; and there is nothing allowed by them to make void an oath with any Protestant, but the same would invalidate it likewise with those of their own communion. Hear what the Jesuits themselves say in this matter. Laymann is thus positive : “ *Dico 4to. Si Catholicum cum hæreticis publicum fœdus ineant, non potest per auctoritatem pontificiam solvi, aut relaxari.*”¹ Becanus is still more particular :—“ *Virtutes illæ,*” “ Those virtues,” says he, “ from whence arises the obligation of being faithful in what we have promised, equally oblige us, whether it be with Catholics or heretics ; because it

¹ *Theol. Moral.*, ii. 3. 12. [Laymann (1572-1635) taught philosophy, theology, and canon law in several German colleges, and wrote *Theol. Moral. et Canon.*]

is never lawful to lie, never lawful to violate another's right, nor to do any injustice, nor to forswear."¹ Thus runs the current of their divines and casuists : whence it must be owned that there is no necessity of a separate communion upon this account, since the same is taught on both sides. It must be likewise owned that they acknowledge no imposing any doctrine contrary to this, since the discipline of that Church does not allow any to run counter to it ; and if it be not imposed (as matter of fact shows it is not), then, according to our second rule, this ought to be made no breach of communion.

QUEST. III. Whether it be not a detestable principle in the Church of Rome to judge any evil lawful, so it be for the good of Mother Church, and not to stick at breaking of promises and vows, and doing evil, so that there be any hopes of good coming of it ?

These are certainly most detestable principles ; but upon examination into their Councils, professions of faith, catechisms, divines, etc., I can find no such doctrine taught by them. But, on the contrary, having looked over their treatises of morality, to which this subject belongs, I find them delivering the very same principles as we do. So that upon the question of the conditions requisite for a human action to be good, they positively assert that three perfections are required, viz. : 1. That the object be good ; 2. That the motive or end be good ; 3. That the cir-

¹ *Quæst. de Fid. Hæret. Serv.* vii. [Becanus (1550-1624) was a Jesuit and Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Mayence, Wurzburg, and Vienna successively, and confessor to the Emperor Ferdinand II. He wrote several controversial works.]

cumstances be good. And that if any of these be wanting, the action cannot be good ; according to the common maxim, *Bonum ex integra causa ; malum ex quocunque defectu*. This being their constant doctrine, we must own no occasion of difference upon this account.

Now if some matters of fact acted by men of that communion be considered, it is true one might then naturally judge they have been carried on by such pernicious principles. But the deduction of principles from some matters of fact is too rigid a logic for any Church whatever to bear ; and being not just in itself, it is what I think we ought not to press, especially since the doctrine of that Church is otherwise evident, and it is nowhere required by her to approve of such practices which have given the occasion of this charge. For thus, according to our second rule, this question ought to be laid by.

And this more especially when there is evident matter of fact to demonstrate they approve not such pernicious principles, but choose rather to suffer the most weighty inconveniences than act by them. This seems evident by what has passed here with us. The penal laws against the Papists have excluded them for above these hundred years from many great advantages which other subjects enjoy ; and though by taking an oath, test, or declaration, or performing some outward act of religion, they might be exempt from all such penalties, and qualify themselves for doing great service both to their families and for the interest of their Church, yet no prospect of private or public good has

been enough to make them subscribe any form, or do any religious action which they judged to be unlawful. And if any have done it, they have at the same time left the communion of that Church, and thus have given demonstration that it is not allowed by them to break their oaths nor subscribe forms which they believe erroneous, nor do evil for the good of their Church, or that any other good may come of it; it being in their power at any time to do what will be for their own interest and their Church if they will but seek it by such means as they judge unlawful. This seems to me evidence enough of their principles, and, consequently, that upon this score there is no necessity of separating communion.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of murdering Protestants, of the Plots, Treasons, and Massacres by Papists.

QUEST. I. Whether it be not a horrid principle in the Papists to think it a meritorious act to murder Protestants?

Murder is certainly horrid, but after all the search I have made, I can find no such Popery taught in the Church of Rome. It is in no Council, or profession of faith, or catechism; it is nowhere recommended, much less imposed upon any of that communion; and consequently, though great barbarities have been committed by Papists, yet that Church nowhere obliges any to partake in or even approve them, therefore ought not, according to our second rule, [to] be any obstruction to communion.

I have carefully perused their explications of that commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," especially in the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, which is purposely composed by that Church for the instruction of the people, and find there all murder to be as strictly forbid as we can desire. There is shown how detestable a crime it is; how rigorously God has prohibited it; that they who

murder do strike at God Himself, and with violent hands, as it were, make their attempt against Him. There it is styled "*detestabile scelus, immanis crudelitas, et diabolicus impetus*"—"detestable wickedness, a horrid and barbarous cruelty, and diabolical violence," and nothing omitted that is capable of imprinting a horror of this crime; and this in general, without any regard to religion, but only to the effusion of human blood. Hence I must say that, as to this commandment, their doctrine is the same with ours, and there seems to me no necessity of a separate communion on this account.

QUEST. II. Whether the barbarous murders, cruelties, and massacres committed by the Papists on Protestants be not evidence of their principles in this point?

The very thought of these barbarities is horrid, and if I could find that the communion of that Church did oblige to partake in or approve such practices, I should protest against all communication with it. But after all my best endeavours, I can find nothing which obliges the members of that Church to approve such cruelties, so that whatever encouragement they have had, yet this nowhere is proposed, and much less imposed on any; but all in that communion are as much at liberty for abhorring murder, and even those very barbarities which have been committed by Papists, as we are in our Church. Hence, without looking further into these sad histories, according to our second rule, there seems no necessity of separating on this account, since a communion with that Church nowhere obliges to partake in or approve such cruelties.

QUEST. III. Whether so many plots, treasons, re-

bellions, murders of princes, and infinite other vile attempts, managed and carried on by Papists against Protestants, be not enough to convince any of the principles of their religion, and to give us an abhorrence of all thoughts of communion with them?

There is horror enough in looking back into such bloody annals. But then it is to be considered whether the character of a religion and the true measure of its principles are to be taken from the practices of such as have been members of it. It is to be considered whether the unwarrantable and wicked actions of the members of a Church are justly charged upon the Church to which they belong.

In resolving this point, I have recalled to mind the numberless treasons, rebellions, violence, cruelties, and barbarous effusion of blood, such as stand recorded in undoubted history. And having reflected who have been the persons engaged in them, as I find no nation in Christendom exempt, so likewise no sort or division of Christians whatever. All have been actors in some of them; in many it has been Papist against Papist; in many, Protestant against Protestant; in many, Papist against Protestant; and in many, Protestant against Papist. Let the several changes and revolutions of government that have been either effected or attempted in most nations be considered; let the treasons, plots, and invasions that have been made against lawful sovereigns be called over. And as all religions are here concerned, so I ask whether from such unlawful actions can be taken a true measure of the respective religions, or of their principles? If it

may, then I ask again, who will fling the first stone while all are guilty, and though not alike, yet so as not to be innocent? And if hence cannot be taken a just measure, then why should it be used as a measure when it is none?

The Gunpowder Plot, in November 1605, is counted an eternal blemish to all Papists. But does not the barbarous murder of King Charles I. in 1648, with the renouncing then, and by Act of their Parliament disinheriting for ever, as they thought, the whole family of the Stuarts, as equally affect all Protestants? They who would know how they first tell their own story, may among others see *The Catholique Apology, with a Reply*, etc., by a person of honour¹ (the third edition, 1674); and *The Advocate of Christian Liberty* (1673); and *The Roman Church Vindicated*, etc. (London, 1674), from which last is taken the following account: "The wicked undertakings of a few of that religion does no more entitle the Catholic body to that infamy than Poltrot's murdering the Duke of Guise, or Hubert's burning of London, or Beza's open rebellion against his lawful King in France, or Knox's conspiracy against the Queen-Regent, etc., do entail that brand upon Protestant religion: a truth King James was so well satisfied of, that his royal mouth becometh our compurgator against that unjust imputation, when, in his declaration against that plot, he saith, that "the generality of his Catholic subjects did abhor such a detestable

¹ [The editor of the 1801 edition adds in a note, "I believe the Earl of Castlemaine."]

conspiracy no less than himself.' Let the minister then learn that justice of His Majesty, not to throw his calumnies at random at the innocent body as well as guilty particulars, lest his envious partiality be made a precedent to atheistical spirits to style Judas's fact an apostolical conspiracy."

The same author goes on: "But why a *Popish plot*? Were not all the engines of policy most diligently employed to discover the depth of that detestable attempt? And could all their wisdom find above thirteen laymen and four Jesuits (by their own account) of all that either were actors therein or privy to the same? (as you may read in Speed in King James's reign, and Baker,¹ and their printed confessions), not one nobleman, not one of all the peers, nor any other of the Catholic gentry either knowing or approving of that wicked conspiracy; which persuasion is built upon this just ground (amongst others), viz.—That those had not tenderness enough to leave any other undiscovered whose conscience compelled them to expose their own confessors to their deserved penalty. Besides that, Speed acknowledgeth that the Catholic lords were to have undergone the same barbarous fate with the rest. To which we may add, that Osborn tells us that this plot was the Treasurer's device."² So he.

¹ [See Speed, *History of Great Britain*, pp. 890, 894; Baker, *Chronicles of Kings of England* (ed. 1733), pp. 405, 407; cf. on this subject Butler's *Book of R. C. Church*, pp. 280 *sqq.*]

² *Memoirs of King James*, pp. 35, 37 [ed. 1656]. [Osborn (1589-1659) was a Puritan and Republican. He wrote several works, among which are *Memoirs of the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James.*]

Now, if anything be amiss in the form of prayer to be used yearly upon the fifth day of November, or in that for the thirtieth of January, or whatever else is added to the Book of Common Prayer, forasmuch as these depend wholly upon the royal mandate, and not (as the Common Prayer itself does) upon the Parliament, the remedy may be the more easily procured. For which see what Archbishop Laud says, in the speech often before mentioned, for his own vindication against the innovations charged upon him: "The ninth innovation is, That two places are changed in the prayers set forth for the fifth of November, and ordered to be read (they say) by Act of Parliament. To this I say first, It is a notorious untruth that this book was ordered to be read by Act of Parliament. The Act of Parliament indeed is printed before it, and therein is a command for prayers and thanksgivings every fifth of November, but not one word or syllable for the form of prayer. That is left to the Church; therefore here is no innovation against that Act of Parliament." And afterwards: "His Majesty," saith he, "expressly commanded me to make the alterations and see them printed, which is here noted because I think it may be of good use if well considered."

Thus, then, I reason the case, and find the argument either to involve all, or else come short of all. But laying this aside, I think the plain truth is this: That people of all religions, when they have either feared oppression, or have been solicitous to shake off any yoke, or have had their hopes of liberty raised by designing and ambitious men, have either rashly

engaged, or under the cover of God's cause been deluded into unwarrantable actions, without considering how they squared with common principles, or at least finding some reasons to dispense with them in extraordinary exigencies.

Thus it has been with persons of all persuasions, whence I am inclined to judge that such violent and wicked undertakings are not generally to be laid to religion, but to ambition, passion, and party; that religion is pretended to strengthen the cause, and if religion has been really the occasion, that principles are then framed to serve the turn, but not to be made a rule, or imposed on all that belong to that Communion; and though books have been writ to justify such proceedings, yet still without obliging any to assent to such principles. Whether this be the case of all I do not undertake to determine, but it seems to be that of the Church of Rome. For though many horrid facts have been committed by Papists, and some of them have books to favour them, yet still that Church nowhere requires any to approve either such facts, or the principles by which they are; but there is the same liberty within that Church of disapproving and dissenting from all such villanies as there is for others that are without that pale. Hence, since there may be a communicating with that Church without joining in any wickedness acted by them, therefore, according to our second rule, this question ought not to make a separate communion.

CHAPTER XV.

Of Antichrist, and the Idolatry of Rome.

QUEST. I. Whether the Pope be Antichrist, and the Papists idolaters?

Bishop Montague is plain as to the Antichrist mentioned in holy Scripture. "I profess," saith he, ingenuously, "I am not of opinion that the Bishop of Rome personally is that Antichrist, nor yet that the Bishops of Rome successively are that Antichrist so spoken of."¹ And so also to the Informers: "Who concluded it but yourselves to be flat Popery not to believe or preach that the Pope is that Antichrist? Or to profess the contrary, that he is not that Antichrist? Who can find it to be the doctrine of the Church of England? And what Synod resolved it, Convocation assented to it? What Parliament, law, proclamation, or edict did ever command it to be professed, or have imposed penalty upon repugnants or non-consentients unto it?"²

And as to anything of idolatry or the common charge of Antichrist, Mr. Thorndike is positive against

¹ Montague, *Gagger for New Gospel*, pp. 74, 75.

² *Ibid.*, *Just Appeal*, ch. v. p. 143.

it. "They," says he, "that separate from the Church of Rome as idolaters are thereby schismatics before God." And again: "Let not them who charge the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Papists idolaters, lead the people by the nose to believe that they can prove their supposition when they cannot."¹

And Bishop Parker, speaking of this charge of idolatry, is also very plain: "So black a crime," says he, "as this, that is no less than renouncing God, is not lightly to be charged upon any party of Christians, not only because of the foulness of the calumny, but the barbarous consequences that may follow upon it, to invite and warrant the rabble, whenever opportunity favours, to destroy the Roman Catholics and their images, as the Israelites were commanded to destroy the Canaanites and their idols. But before so bloody an indictment be preferred against the greatest part of Christendom, the nature of the thing ought to be well understood. The charge is too big for a scolding word. And how inconsistent soever idolatry may be with salvation, I fear so uncharitable a calumny (if it prove one) can be of no less damnable consequence. It is a piece of inhumanity, that outdoes the savageness of the cannibals themselves, and damns at once both body and soul. And yet after all we have no other ground for the bold conceit than the crude and rash assertions of some popular divines, who have no other measures of truth or zeal but hatred to Popery, and therefore never spare for hard words against that

¹ Thorndike, *Just Weights and Measures*. [*Works*, vol. v. pp. 81, 85, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*]

Church, and run up all objections against it into nothing less than atheism and blasphemy, of which idolatry is the greatest instance.”¹

And afterwards, more particularly examining this charge as consisting of these three heads: 1. The worship of images; 2. Adoration of the Host; 3. Invocation of Saints,—he has these words worthy to be considered: “But as to the first, the use of images in the worship of God, I cannot but admire at the confidence of these men to make so bold a charge against them in general, when the images of the cherubim were commanded by God Himself (Exod. xxv. 22). They were the most solemn and sacred part of the Jewish religion, and therefore, though images, so far from idolatry that God made them the seat of His presence, and from between them delivered His oracles, so that something more is required to make idolatry than the use of images. This instance is so plain and obvious to every reader, there being nothing more remarkable in all the Old Testament than the honour done to the cherubim, that it is a much greater wonder to me that those men who advance the objection of idolatry so groundlessly can so slightly rid themselves of so pregnant a proof against it.” And again: “Till therefore it be proved that they worship images of false gods as the supreme Deities, or that they worship the true God by corporeal images and representations of His divine nature, there is no footing for idolatry in Christendom.”

He goes on: “As for the adoration of the Host,

¹ *Reasons for Abrogating Test*, pp. 72, 73.

when they can prove it is given to it either as a symbol of a false God, or the picture of the true one, howsoever faulty it may be otherwise, it can be no idolatry. And as for the invocation of Saints, unless they worship them as the Supreme God, the charge of idolatry is an idle word, and the adoration itself that is given to them as saints is a direct protestation against idolatry, because it supposes a superior Deity, and that supposition cuts off the very being of idolatry.”¹

It will be needless to cite any other of our writers upon this subject, because these were eminent persons in our Church. And though this great cry of Anti-christianism and idolatry is so often repeated, even in the instances above mentioned, that I could not but here take notice of it again, yet surely what is now said by these learned men, with that before noted to the same purpose in this Essay, may, by the help of our rules, fairly contribute to a friendly agreement also in this point.

¹ *Reasons for Abrogating Test*, pp. 129, 130, 133.

CHAPTER XVI.

Of Ceremonies, the Crucifix, and Lights on the Altar, Incense, Sign of the Cross, and Holy Water.

QUEST. I. Whether there be not a number of unprofitable ceremonies in the Church of Rome, which bring the New Law to the resemblance of the Old, and obscure the glory of God ?

This point may be easily composed, while it is in a matter in which both sides allow a great latitude. The Church of Rome allows a great difference of ceremonies within its communion, as is manifest in its several rituals, which are different, according to the ancient and immemorial custom of national Churches and even dioceses. The Eastern Churches all differ in ceremonies from the West, and yet no difference of communion upon this account.

A great latitude is likewise allowed by our Church, as may be seen in what is prefaced to our Common Prayer-Book concerning ceremonies, where, having given a reason why some ceremonies are retained and some laid by, it is thus added : “ In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything, but to our own people only ; for we think it convenient that every country should use such ceremonies

as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition."

This, then, is a point in which both Churches seem inclined to yield, and therefore, were there but a true desire of peace, there is likely to be no obstacle on this account.

QUEST. II. What need is there for a crucifix and lights upon the altar?

Some of our historians tell us that Queen Elizabeth had her altar, with crucifix, lights, and other adornments, as before used in her chapel, till reasons of state more than religion removed them. And we now have altars, where may be seen in sacred characters the sacred name Jehovah surrounded with a glory. Here are also the two tables of the old law, with Moses and Aaron at their sides. Yea, we have great candles too, contented with only saving ourselves the trouble and charge of lighting them.

QUEST. III. Why is incense now used under the dispensation of the new law?

It is to raise devotion, to affect priest and people with the mysteriousness of the action to which it is applied, and to cause a pious esteem of it. Besides, it signifies that our prayers ought to ascend as a sweet perfume in the sight of God. St. Dionysius mentions it.¹ And there seems nothing more plain than what the Lord Himself said, by the mouth of

¹ Dionys. *De Eccl. Hierar.*, ch. iii. [The so-called works of Dionysius the Areopagite were probably composed in the fifth century. The use

His prophet Malachy, foretelling the use hereof in the time of the Gospel: "From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down thereof, My name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering."¹

QUEST. IV. Is not the frequent use of signing with the sign of the cross a great matter of complaint?

In the *Alliance of Divine Offices* we find the use of this sign at the healing of the Evil, in the reigns of King Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth.² And our Church still continuing it at Baptism, without condemning the more frequent use of it, as it shows there is no iniquity in the thing itself, so also, that the repetition thereof is not unlawful, but may be good and convenient, according as circumstances, in the judgment of our superiors, shall determine it. I might quote Bishop Montague and others to justify the frequent use of the sign of the cross. But I would here only repeat a little of what the learned Dr. Falkner, one of great moderation, has said on this subject in his *Libertas Ecclesiastica*,³ where he begins with telling us in general that the sign of the cross, if rightly understood, would appear to be of very good and profitable use. Then he gives some account of the practice of the primitive Church in the use of this sign for a threefold end and purpose: 1. As a *professing*

of incense is referred to as an established custom in divine worship in a fragment of the Pseudo-Hippolytus of the third century. See *Writings of Hippolytus*, vol. ii. p. 120, in *Ante-Nicene Lib.*]

¹ Mal. i. 11.

² L'Estrange, *Alliance Div. Off.*, ch. viii. [p. 373, *Anglo-Cath. Lib.*]

³ L. ii. cap. 4, sect. 2.

sign, whereby they testified openly their honouring Christ crucified, either before them who denied the Christian name or among themselves ; or, as our canon expresses it, they hereby made an outward show and profession, even to the astonishment of the Jews, that they were not ashamed to acknowledge Him for their Lord and Saviour who died upon the cross. 2. This sign was most frequently used as an *expression of hope and trust in Christ crucified*, and of confidence in Him, expectation of blessing from Him, and supplication unto God by Him. 3. The sign of the cross was also generally made upon the foreheads of them who *were received into the Church*. The intent of which sign in this use thereof was, that the Church did hereby solemnly testify those persons having relation to the Christian society to stand obliged to maintain the Christian profession and life ; and so far as concerned her authority, did hereby dedicate or engage them thereto, and charge and require those to be mindful thereof ; and this was a token to admonish them that they must not be ashamed to confess the Christian faith, and to fight under Christ's banner, and to serve and honour Him. After which he treats of this sign as used in our Church in the office of Baptism, and in all the instances shows a great deal of good reading for the proof and illustration of this subject. St. Austin (as there cited) saith, "*Usque adeo de cruce non erubesco*," etc. "I am so far from being ashamed of the cross that I do not put the cross of Christ in some hidden place, but carry it on my forehead."¹ Cyril exhorteth,

¹ Aug. *Enarr. in Ps. cxlii.* [E.V. cxli.] 3.

“Let us not be ashamed to confess Him who was crucified; let the *σφαγῆς* (the sign of the cross) be confidently made upon the forehead with the finger.” And the use of this sign was anciently very common in the actions of life, even in retirement and privacy; as is expressed by Tertullian, [*“Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum et calceatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quæcunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem signaculo terimus.”*]¹ Thus St. Chrysostom directed the Christian when he went abroad, that he might be in safety under the divine protection, to disclaim the devil, and express his adhering to Christ with using the sign of the cross.² When Julian, after his apostasy, was affrighted and terrified while he thought to consult with the devil, as a remedy against his fears, he signed himself with the sign of the cross, which Nazianzen (*Orat.* 3) expresseth with words which show his use of that sign to be a declaration of flying for aid and expecting help from Christ, whom he persecuted. Upon this account this sign was anciently used in the working miracles, as is expressed by Nazianzen, Epiphanius, and other Fathers, as a visible testimony of confidence in Christ.³ Thus he, with a great deal more which I have here omitted, because I think that this consideration of the sign of the cross as being so useful, a short profession of faith, a prayer, and declaration of our trust in Christ, for great blessings, and against great evils, is enough to allay all heats about

¹ Tertul. *De Cor. Mil.*, iii. 3, cf. *Ad Uxor*, ii. 5.

² *Hom.* xxi. *ad Pop. Ant.*

³ Falkner, *Libertas Ecclesiastica*, ii. 4. 2.

the superstitious uses thereof, and to cause such a good understanding between all concerned herein that there may be no breach of communion upon this score.

QUEST. V. Can any people of sense endure to hear of holy water, and stand still without horror to have it thrown on their faces?

Having had the concurrence of so many in the points above mentioned, I did not think any one would startle at a dash of holy water. There is an early mention of holy water with approbation in Numb. v. 17. This rite now used was aptly figured by the waters of expiation, which did sanctify and cleanse the polluted, Numb. xix. 18. It is encouraged by King David: "*Asperges me hyssopo*," etc. "Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop and I shall be clean; Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow" (Psalm l. or li. 7). And St. Paul warrants it: "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5), where what the Apostle speaks of the benediction of meats, may be well applied to anything that may be sanctified, offered, and consecrated to God. St. Clement tells us that this holy water is an apostolical constitution. He says that St. Matthew did institute the use of it, and he relates the manner of his blessing it.¹ Pope Alexander I., the sixth Pope from St. Peter,

¹ *Const. Apost.* B. viii. ch. 29 [vol. xvii. of *Ante-Nicene Library*, p. 243. This chapter is not in the Coptic or Syriac. The Apostolical Constitutions are generally supposed to date from the second or third century.]

made a decree about it, but such as supposed the use of it before. "*Aquam sale conspersam populis benedicimus,*" etc. "We bless for the people water with salt, that all who are sprinkled therewith may be sanctified and purified, and which we command all priests to do." So it was not then his invention, but a custom. And his reasons for the use of it are these: "If the ashes of an heifer, being sprinkled with blood, did sanctify and cleanse the people, much more, water sprinkled with salt, and sanctified by divine prayers. And if the sterility of the waters were healed by the prophet Elisha, with salt sprinkled therein, by how much more, being sanctified by divine prayer, may it take away the sterility of human things, and avert the snares of the devil, and defend men from phantastic wiles, and hallow those that are defiled." And again: "If we doubt not but that the sick were healed by the touch of our Saviour's garments, how much more, by virtue of His words, may the elements, divinely hallowed, bring health of body."¹ St. Basil the Great reckons it among the apostolical traditions.² And so also for the effects of it, St. Epiphanius shows that Joseph, a convert Jew, did dissolve incantations by it.³ And St. Hierome doth testify the same of St. Hilarion (*Vit. Hilar. Mon.*). Besides, St. Bernard witnesseth that St. Malachias therewith cured a frantic man, and

¹ [The Epistles ascribed to St. Alexander (Pope 109-119) cannot be regarded as genuine, but there is no doubt as to the antiquity of the use of holy water, which passed from the Jewish into the Christian Church.]

² Basil, *De Sp. Sanct.* 27. [St. Basil is speaking of the blessing of Baptismal water, which, however, of course, involves the general principle.]

³ Epiph. *Adv. Hær.* [Lib. i. tom. ii. Hær. xxx. 12.]

a woman that had a grievous cancer (*De Vit. S. Malach.*). This shows the use ancient and profitable. And it is certain that the holy Fathers at least believed it to be good both for body and soul.

In our Church there is enough to abate our prejudices against the hallowing, that is, the sanctifying of waters, in those words of our public office for Baptism: "Almighty and everlasting God, who by the baptism of Thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin." And in the Liturgy for Scotland, it is added: "Sanctify this fountain of baptism, Thou which art the Sanctifier of all things." Bishop Andrewes, in his strictures upon the two miracles of Joseph the convert Jew, in Epiphanius, and Marcellus, the Bishop of Apamea, in Theodoret, produced by Cardinal Perron, on this subject, does not deny them, but only says, that if they were so done, it was rather by virtue of the faith in Christ than of the water or sign, known many times since to have had no such effect; adding, that two miracles, without any canon to enjoin it, will not conclude any rule for the practice of it in the Church.¹ Now since this faith is equally an ingredient in all such miracles, so that our Saviour Himself could do nothing among some people because of their unbelief, and everybody knows that the most powerful antidote has not always the same effect; since, if these two miracles be allowed, there are many more will be brought upon the same authority, and one of these alone is sufficient; since, whether there

¹ Andrewes, *Stricture* [*Minor Works*, p. 27, *Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.*]

be a canon or no canon for it, it may be a custom and practice in the Church, and that too for good purposes, to remind us of our baptism, and to fortify us against the illusions of evil spirits ; yea, since our bishop here shows but little or no dislike thereof, what does he herein but dispose us to believe it of good use? Which I am the more inclined to think he intended, because here, but a little before, on such another occasion, he does as faintly oppose the Cardinal, about mingling of wine with water in the Eucharist ;¹ when as it is observed, in his own form of consecrating a church or chapel, that then, in the celebration of this Sacrament, when left to his own reasoning, he used this mingling himself.² Why not then the hallowed water? The devil indeed abhors it, because he has found the power and virtue of it, to his own confusion. Which we all must own, having declared it to the whole world in that our national proverb, where, in reference to one that greatly hates anything, it is usually said, "He loves it, as the devil loves holy water." So that after all, unless we would take an ill example, it is hoped that even this point, as the rest, according to our rules, may be no longer a cause of disunion.

¹ [Andrewes, *ut supra*, p. 25.]

² [See *Catechist. Doctrine and other Minor Works*, p. 326. "Episcopus . . . pane fracto, vino in calicem effuso, et aquâ admistâ, stans ait;" and cf. *Notes on Common Prayer in Minor Works, ut supra*, p. 157, "dein vinum e doliolo in calicem haurit, tum aquam e triconali scypho immiscet."]

CHAPTER XVII.

Of the great Averseness in the Romanists against the English Ministry.

QUEST. I. Whether there may not, upon a fair proposal, be a full agreement about the ministry of our Church?

This is a matter of very great concern, and such differences there are upon this account, as between our Church and the Dissenters, so between the Romanists and us, that unless there be an accommodation here, it will be vain to hope for Catholic communion.

In a late *Essay towards a Comprehension*,¹ there is a proposal offered, in behalf of the present Dissenting ministers, to this effect: That, without any new ordination to priesthood, they shall be, by laying on of the hands of the bishop only, and by the delivery of the Bible unto them (I suppose upon their knees), particularly authorised to execute that office in that particular congregation, to which they are lawfully appointed, in those words of our ordinal, "Take thou authority to preach the word," etc.

¹[*An Essay towards Comprehension, or a Persuasive to Unity among Protestants*, by a Lover of Peace and Unity: published in 1701, and again in 1718. See Introduction, p. 17.]

Then follow the arguings on both sides. The Churchmen plead that the ordination of the Dissenters is done in a schism, and without any lawful authority; in opposition to the established order of the National Church; and that it is done without the consent and concurrence of the bishop, who in the English Church has the chief jurisdiction in the ecclesiastical affairs, without whose concurrence therefore the ordination received from the hands of the Dissenters, as null in itself, and contrary to the established order and government of the Church of England, ought to be reiterated and renewed.¹

The Dissenters, on the other hand, plead that supposing they were ordained in a schism, yet their ordination is valid and good, being done by the Presbytery, or those who execute the office of Presbyters, in that way which is required by the Scriptures, viz., by fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands. That therefore there is the same reason for the re-baptizing of those who are not baptized by those of the Church of England, which yet they do not allow of, as there is for re-ordaining those who are not ordained by the Churchmen.² They argue, farther, that many of the Reformed Churches abroad ordain their ministers by the same Church-officers as the Dissenters do in England; and that therefore, if the ordination of Dissenters here in England be null, theirs also must be null; and by consequence they can have no

¹ [The author omits here the main point, viz., that the ordinations in question are not episcopal, and therefore are certainly invalid.]

² [Lay baptism has always been held valid in the Church; there is no analogy therefore between the two cases.]

ordinances, and are no Churches, as having no ministers, who are an integral part of the Visible Church. That therefore though (if the consequence of the action reached no further than themselves) they might for peace sake submit to be re-ordained, yet they can never be induced to do that which is, in effect, to unchurch so great a part of the Reformation, and which must of necessity put a weapon into the hands of the Papists against them ; for which reasons, though they would do what lies in them for the promoting the peace and welfare of our English Israel, they cannot submit to be re-ordained.

But then withal, it is to be considered that there are also as great debates between us and the Romanists upon this point. For though I cannot willingly believe but that our orders are good, because, in the 36th Article of Religion, our Church does tell us that the Ordinal, or Book of Consecration and Ordering, set forth in the time of King Edward VI., and at the same time confirmed by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering, without anything of itself superstitious and ungodly ; and therefore they decree all such as are consecrated or ordered according to the same rites to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered ; and there was a dispensation in behalf of King Edward's clergy, granted by Cardinal Pole, and confirmed by the Pope, in the reign of Queen Mary ; and under Queen Elizabeth there was, besides patents, an Act of Parliament (8 Elizabeth) to put an end to the disputes about her clergy ; and the

Ordinal was made better under King Charles II. ; and we have necessity to plead for us ; and our orders have, with great show of reason, been vindicated by Mr. Mason, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Fern, Bishop Burnet, Dr. Saywell, Dr. Fuller, Mr. Brown, and others in great numbers ; yea, our orders have been sometimes owned even by some of the Roman Communion ;¹ yet, on the other part, it is likewise urged with great earnestness that, in the first Parliament of Queen Mary, all consecrations which had been made according to the Ordinal of Edward the Sixth were declared to be null and void, which is taken notice of by Dr. Heylin in his *History of the Reformation*. And soon after the Bishops procured from the Queen an Injunction to all the ordinaries in the realm to execute certain articles, wherein it was declared that such persons as had been promoted to any orders after the new sort and fashion of orders were not ordained in very deed. Which Mr. Fox mentions in his *Act. and Mon.* (Par. 2), and thereupon in the Index makes this note : “ Ministers revolting to Popery must, with their new religion, have new orders.” And it is further said that, whatever the dispensation was, it was the Papal power, and we are to thank the Pope and Cardinal for it ; that it supposes a great defect in that clergy, but extended only to such as had been ordained after the ancient and Catholic manner in the time of schism, as appears even

¹ [Among these may be reckoned Du Pin (see Pusey's *Eirenicon*, p. 231), and Courayer, whose work in vindication of English orders appeared at Paris in 1724, and in an English translation in London in 1728 ; also Bossuet.]

by the degradations of Ridley and Hooper only from their priesthood, and not from episcopacy, because not allowed to be bishops, and in that, as for Mr. Bradford, made priest by the new form, they did not degrade him at all, but treated him as a mere laic, the orders conferred by the new Ordinal being then rejected as not good.¹ And they were made worse under Queen Elizabeth, if the story of the Nag's Head, or what the Reverend Mr. St[ephens]² has wrote about the consecrators then, be true, [which is] farther demonstrated by Bishop Bonner's plea; so that there was no help but by the Act of Parliament, 8 Elizabeth, which yet, as the patents, is thought to make the case worse. And worse still if the report also of the non-baptism of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, or of his latitudinarian principle, may pass.³ Besides that, they say the emendation of the Ordinal came too late. And they will not allow of any necessity to be pleaded for us. And it is matter of fact that our orders are not allowed by the Church of Rome, but though they hold re-ordination to be a sacrilege, they own not our ministers that go over to them to be priests till they be ordained by them, as if never ordained before. And there are several books they

¹ [But Ridley, Latimer, and Farrar, who had all been consecrated according to the Roman Pontifical, were degraded from their priesthood only, as well as Hooper. This objection of Renaudot's is very fully examined in chap. xiii. of Courayer's *Validity of English Ordinations*. The Nag's Head fable is rejected by Lingard, Note I, at end of vol. vii. *Hist. of England*.]

² [See Introduction, p. 18.]

³ [Tillotson, made Archbishop by William III. in place of Sancroft in 1691. He was no doubt a "latitudinarian," but the denial of his baptism appears to have been unfounded. See Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, p. 3.]

have written too against our orders ; such are, *Protestants' Demonstrations against Protestant Ministers* ; and *The Treatise with Reflection upon the Nullity of the English Protestants' Church and Clergy* ; and *The Nullity of the Prelatique Clergy and Church of England* ; both the *Erastus's* ; the *Relation of the English Reformation* ; and several others before and since them, too many to be here set down. And as for those few of that Communion that have at any time spoke favourably of our orders, we are told that their charity was mistaken therein, and they were under the displeasure of their Church, or shrewdly suspected.

It is here also to be noted that Mr. St[ephens] above mentioned, who is eminent for his zeal in religion, has, notwithstanding his orders, thought fit to insist upon an extraordinary call to the ministry ; though indeed I do not hear of any miracle he has yet done to ascertain it, and an uncertain call, as an uncertain clergy, and an uncertain Church, can give no comfortable assurance to us.

This certainly is to be well considered. The more because the famous Mr. Dodwell, whom we ought to honour for his learning, is very positive that where they want episcopal ordination they have no ministry, no sacrament, no Church, are out of the Covenant of Grace and hope of salvation.

What then is to be done here on our side ? What to make us all easy on this point ? Methinks by our own rules there may be some expedient and a good accommodation, if we would take care not to let

ignorance, prejudice, and passion blind us, or hinder any good design ; not to be tied up to any faction, but to embrace truth wherever we meet it. Unity among Protestants only, if it were possible to be had, would not serve the ends of our holy religion. We should all of us endeavour a more Catholic union, that there may be an universal peace over the whole Christian world. It is therefore here, with the greatest submission to superiors and others, most humbly asked, why upon our agreement in the other instances there may not, without lessening the honour of our Church, or making any unbecoming condescensions, be a modest Christian address to his Holiness, who is generally looked upon as the common Father of Christendom ; whom King James I. owned Patriarch of the West, and his Church our Mother Church ; whom our writers, bishops, and others often mention, as they do Cardinal Pole too, with respect, at least on this occasion, for the kindness we think done us by the dispensation granted to King Edward's clergy, from whence the succession of our present ministry is derived ;¹ to consider now our plea, and to allow, if it may be done, our present orders, or to ordain us only conditionally, as it is usual to baptize conditionally in the case of a doubtful or much suspected baptism. By this all interests may be served. Our bishops and the whole clergy may be secured of their places, profits, and honours, and may also, without

¹ [The Bull of Julius III. draws no distinction between those ordained in schism under Henry VIII. and under Edward VI., all of whom Pole is directed to reconcile and reinstate, but not to re-ordain.]

scruple, exercise all their ministerial functions. And then the laity too may be all at ease; they may safely disburthen themselves, trust their souls with their spiritual guides, and receive their benedictions with comfort.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Conclusion.

I SHOULD remind those concerned herein that not only the word Mass, as observed before, but priests and altars, with their usual vestures and ornaments, sacrifice, paten, and corporas, chalice with wine and water, communion in one kind in case of necessity, bread made in the form of a wafer, and after consecration taken at the priest's hands by the people in their mouths, reservation of the sacrament, triple mersions, chrysoms, and oils, commemoration of the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, invocation of angels, so far as to beseech God to command our prayers and supplications by their ministry to be brought up into His holy tabernacle before the sight of His Divine Majesty, prayers for the dead, extreme unction, crossings, and other things now in dispute, were retained in the first Liturgy of King Edward VI. A Liturgy which, the statute that enacted it (2 and 3 Ed. VI. c. 1) says, "was made by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain of the most learned and discreet Bishops, and

other learned men of this realm, having as well eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught in the Scripture as to the primitive Church ;” and which the same statute says also, “ was by the aid of the Holy Ghost, with one agreement, concluded, set forth, and delivered to His Majesty, to his great comfort and quietness of mind.” A Liturgy which this King Edward himself recommended in his message, written the 8th of July, in the third year of his reign, to the rebels of Cornwall and Devonshire, then disgusted at it, in these words : “ For the Mass (so it is here called as in the book itself, and also in the statute that enforced it, and in the king’s injunctions), we assure you, no small study and travel hath been spent by all the learned clergy therein, and to avoid all contention thereof it is brought even to the very use as Christ left it, as the Apostles used it, as holy Fathers delivered it ; indeed altered from that which the Popes of Rome for their lucre brought to it.” A Liturgy which the statute (3 and 4 Ed. VI. c. 10) represents as “ a godly order, agreeable to the order of the primitive Church, therein being nothing to be read but the very pure Word of God, or what is evidently grounded upon the same ;” and which even the statute that made it give way to another (5 and 6 Ed. VI. c. 1), could not forbear saying that it was “ a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm ;” soon after also saying that “ the doubts risen in the use and

exercise of it were rather by the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers than of any other worldly cause." A Liturgy, the more esteemed because some of its compilers, before admired for their learning and discretion, have had the honour too to be reckoned among our martyrs. A Liturgy which Archbishop Bancroft of Canterbury, speaking thereof in his sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross, 1588, affirmed to have been published first "with such approbation, as that it was accounted the work of God." A Liturgy which many have wished to be restored, but none more passionately than Mr. St[ephens], who in favour thereof has exposed the other for "a deformed, disordered, Cranmerian changeling," and not spared to charge our Church with "sacrilege, heresy, and schism." God forbid we should give any occasion for this! But hence we may take hope that, upon reflection hereon, since this Liturgy is so greatly desired, is cleared from what the Popes of Rome had for lucre brought to it, has been declared the work of God, concluded by the aid of the Holy Ghost, etc., the several instances above noted therein, and indeed all the points more largely discoursed on in this Essay, may at length be fairly agreed on. And which seems now the sooner to be expected, because a great prelate, in his late printed speech, has already thought fit in some measure to prepare the world for it, by telling it so publicly that there is a proposal made by one who calls himself a High Churchman, that a treaty may be set on foot between our Convocation and the Assembly of the clergy of France, and that we should abate the

regal supremacy and they the papal, then fancying all other matters would be easily adjusted.¹

The learned proposer can answer for himself. What I desire leave to say is this : That having gone through the principal points of controversy that have kept open the breach between the two Churches ever since the first division, and compared them with our rules of peace, which all Churches seem under a necessity of approving, I cannot find but the far greater part of them ought to be laid aside ; and as for the rest, they are so few, that as I cannot but think it an unhappiness that Churches should be divided upon this account, so I cannot but hope, if some learned and zealous lovers of peace were commissioned on both sides by those in power to inquire into this matter, they might find means to compound our differences therein, and take away the great scandal of Christendom occasioned by our divisions.

But, however, while I have made use of these rules offered to our Dissenters, I do not pretend that the case of our Church in respect to the Church of Rome is the same with that of our Dissenters in respect of the Church of England ; but I only plead so far, that since these are rules proper for extinguishing those unnatural heats and animosities which have long been the reproach of Christians, they may so far be made

¹ [The "great prelate" is apparently Wake, who became Bishop of Lincoln in 1705, and made a speech that year in the House of Lords on the reunion of Dissenters to the Church. He had published twenty years before his *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*, suggested by a perusal of Bossuet's famous *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*. In 1716 he became Archbishop of Canterbury, and soon afterwards followed his correspondence with Du Pin on the union of the Churches, on which see Introduction, pp. 24 *seq.*]

use of here, as they may contribute to this end, hoping that charity will accept of them in order to lessen our disputes, without making comparison, whether they press in all cases alike.

One case is too plain, that there are great schisms amongst Christians, to the scandal of their profession and to the injury of all religion; and that wherever the fault be, it is not only that part suffers, but likewise all the rest, since the mischiefs and scandals of schisms spread far beyond the guilt. Hence, I think, it ought to be a common concern to see if there be any expedients of peace, and to try how far they will go, not only for healing the breach on one side, but on all, that so greater may be the glory of peace.

This is what I have attempted, and it being only by way of an essay, I hope mistakes in it will be the more pardonable, since I assert nothing, but only offer what I have done as a proposal to those whose leisure and charity will encourage them to make a more strict scrutiny in these particulars. Into the hands of those I recommend these few sheets, making it my earnest request to them to promote this design as far as it is found serviceable to peace and truth, and charitably to inform me of my mistake, if by oversight in such variety of matter I have said anything that may do service to error.

For I declare (if I know my own heart) there is not any one error in the world which I desire should be benefited by my writing. I desire peace, it is true, and the communion of our Church to be extended, but not at the price of error. Though I cannot but fear some will take offence at what I have done, and arraign

me of this very thing, even of making way for error, because I seem to speak in favour of Popery, and lessen the horror of its errors. But I hope these will give the cause a rehearsing, or examine it again, before they pronounce so severely upon me.

If they will do thus, I hope they will find that my business all along is to examine what are the errors of Popery, and which are the points in which we cannot join. I have considered all its idolatry, superstition, cruelties, barbarities, massacres, etc.; and I do declare from my heart that these are most hateful both to God and man, and that there is no joining with these but by renouncing both Christianity and reason. Who can desire more?

Well, but I have gone further, and asserted that the Church of Rome does not require any to assent to these abominations, and thus have lessened the deformity of Popery. It is true, I have examined what are the terms upon which the Church of Rome offers communion; I have considered what it demands, what it imposes, what are the articles to which it exacts a submission. But then, I desire it may be considered this was the very thing I undertook; for my business was to see if there was a possibility of enlarging the communion of our Church. This could not be done but by inquiring what was the communion of that most considerable division from us which makes up the Church of Rome, and seeing what she imposes on her members. This inquiry then I made, and accordingly I have made a report of what I found, setting down those particulars to which she demands assent.

And where she demands none I have likewise declared it according to truth. This then was necessary, since no peace can be made but by examining the terms proposed by those with whom we are at difference.

Here then it was, that carried by the desire of an universal peace, and of that Catholic communion which was the glory of the primitive Church of Christ, I inquired of the Church of Rome what were the conditions of peace with her.

I inquired whether she demands an assent to, or an approbation of those many plots, treasons, murders, cruelties, barbarities, etc., that have been carried on by Papists to the effusion of so much Christian blood? And I found that she demands no such assent or approbation; but that those that are in her communion may as freely and heartily detest them as in any other communion whatever. Now this owns the facts to be of Papists, and to be unchristian; but it owns too that it is no part of their religion to approve them. And if this be true, why should it not be owned? For my part, I confess it is a comfort to me to find it so, since there is so much of difference removed out of the way, and so much more hopes of peace. Those that are charmed with the deformity of schism amongst Christians may show a zeal in widening the breach; but to me, I own, it looks so scandalous that I am glad to find it lessened.

I inquired whether she demands an assent to the deposing and king-killing doctrine? And I found no such thing required; but that whatever has been writ or done by any of that Church, yet that her com-

munion is open to such as oppose all such principles, and that any one may as heartily disown them in that Church as out of it. I was glad to find this too, since in this there is so much occasion of schism taken out of the way; and there may be communion with that Church without approving such doctrines.

I inquired whether she demands an assent to those many abuses, corruptions, superstitions which had crept in, to the scandal of believers, and gave an occasion to the first thoughts of a reformation? And I found a great part of these confessed by her to be abuses; that she is so far from demanding an assent that she joins with the Reformation in condemning them, and in the Council of Trent gives order for their amendment. I was glad to find this too, since this is so far a preparation for peace, whilst the communion with that Church requires the condemnation of the great part of those corruptions which the Reformation condemns.

I inquired whether she demands an assent to the various opinions of schoolmen, to the loose opinions of the casuists, to the vices, ambition, and covetousness of the churchmen or of the Roman Court? And I found that no assent was required to any of these; but that within her communion there was the same liberty of dissenting from all these as without her pale. I was glad to find this too, because here are so many stumbling-blocks removed out of the way; and none of these things are a hindrance to communion.

I inquired whether in the Church of Rome there was not pardon of sins for money; pardon for un[for]-

saken sins ; whether ignorance was not encouraged, and a liberty of breaking all oaths? And I found, notwithstanding many abuses, that in the Church of Rome is taught the same, as to all these points, which we teach in the Church of England, and that communicating with the Church of Rome does not oblige us to quit anything of what we now believe and hold as to these particulars.

I inquired whether communion with the Church of Rome obliged any to forsake God, or Christ Jesus, or His Gospel, or the commandments? And I found the same creed, the same commandments, and the same Gospel professed and taught in the Church of Rome as with us. That in the Church of Rome they are taught to love God above all things, to seek Him before all things, to put their whole trust in God, to believe in Christ, their only Redeemer and Mediator, through whose merits all things are to be obtained of God, and without whom nothing can be obtained. That, notwithstanding all former prohibitions, the word of God is freely read by the people in her communion ; and that by communicating with her there is no necessity of changing anything of what we now believe and practise as to these particulars.

I inquired whether national Churches in communion with Rome must be stript of all the ancient liberties and privileges belonging to them ; and whether princes in the same communion must of consequence surrender themselves to the beck of the Pope, to be trampled on according to his pleasure? And I found that in the Roman Communion both

national Churches and States may take the same liberty of maintaining their authority, privileges, and immunities, and stand as resolutely against all Papal usurpations, as if they owned no prerogative of power in that See.¹

I inquired at length into those points in which the two Churches differ; and having strictly examined what the Church of Rome teaches in these particulars, and having separated her doctrine from all school opinions and practical abuses, I found the difference in some points to be little more than in terms, and that by eminent and leading men in our own Church is approved and taught the very same, in substance at least, which is taught by the Church of Rome.

This, I own, was a satisfaction to me; for the sentiments of such great men, I hoped, might be a means of compounding these points, and taking away the scandal of division that is between us. Not that I go so far as to impose the particular sentiments of such our prelates or doctors upon our Church, as if it were her general and approved doctrine, for I know it is not. But my hopes were thus raised that there might be some favourable opinion of such doctrines, since they were maintained and taught as primitive truths by pastors and prelates of our own Church, being men of such a character that their piety and learning, and their particular industry in inquiring into the primitive Church, challenge a veneration from

¹ [That is, of course, in matters not involving a breach, in doctrine or discipline, with the general body of the Church, just as the separate States of a Federal Union can legislate independently on matters not reserved to the common Federal authority.]

all; or at least, that seeing such doctrines asserted by prelates of our own Church, we might consider whether it be reasonable to separate from a Church for holding and teaching such doctrines which at the same time are publicly taught by our own pastors, and tolerated in them without censure? Here, I confess, was my encouragement. For since all schism in the sense of the primitive Church is declared so damnable, and all Christianity suffers from the mischiefs of it, I could not but hope that whatever is tolerable would be judged fit to be tolerated upon so pressing a motive as that is of removing division and re-establishing Catholic communion in the Christian world. Which communion I cannot but think might be effected, at least, between these two Churches, by proceeding upon this foot alone of considering what is tolerated on either side. For, by what I observe, so much is tolerated on both sides that there would be found very little difference between the Churches, if they were to be brought as near together as these mutual condescensions would give them leave. For it is not in the Gallican Church only Popery is taught with this moderation, as has been stated in this Essay, but throughout the whole extent of that Church communion is offered upon the same terms, that is, it is nowhere exacted of any (not even in Rome itself, under the Pope's nose) to assent to the excess of the Pope's supremacy, nor to his infallibility, nor to his deposing power, etc., as may be seen in Pope Pius's bull and profession, to which whoever subscribes, as there ordered, is qualified for any Church preferment,

and yet in this there is not one word of these doctrines. So that whether in France or out of France these are no terms of communion, nor is any assent either asked or required to them.

Having thus found things, I have published them as I found them; and if it gives offence to any at first sight, yet I hope upon better consideration it will prove to the satisfaction of all who have a true sense of religion, or any compassion for the unhappy state of Christendom. All these must be sensible that divisions are the misfortune of the Church, and the visible marks of God's just indignation against us, whilst vice and errors, atheism and irreligion, make such advantage of them, and consequently must be satisfied, as in the prospect of a public good, to find any overtures made for removing the great differences that have been so long between us and that most considerable body of Christians in communion with the Roman See.

If there could be no such peace proposed but by approving or uniting with those corruptions and impieties found in that communion, the proposal would then be no service to Christianity, and war would be much better than peace. But since, upon making inquiry, it appears that all such impieties may be, and are, as fully renounced by members of that Church as by ours; since many others are no more than school opinions, or corrupt practices, which none in that communion are bound to approve; since the points in differences are only speculative doctrines, and many of these even favoured by learned

men of our own side ; must not this be a satisfaction, to find that in that great division of Christians, which has been kept up so many years between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, with so much of unchristian heats, there seem to be but very few points which keep open the breach ; that above three parts of those debates may be laid aside, which have hitherto served to exasperate and alienate our minds from all thoughts of peace ; that the Church of Rome does not insist upon those hard terms which have been judged inconsistent with common Christianity, but leaves all to the liberty of renouncing them ; that there is no need of joining in any one of those notorious abominations fixed upon her for joining in her communion ?

Since this, I say, appears, must not this be a comfort to all lovers of peace, to see that where there has been the greatest division, the strangest animosities, the most disedifying heats, there now appear so many differences removed, and so great a preparation for accommodating whatever debates are yet left between them ? I own it again, it is a comfort to me, and I should be heartily glad to see this reconciling method so far pursued by men of power and zeal, till there appear those most desirable effects of Catholic communion and an universal peace.

To give encouragement to this great work, and show these notions to be better built than on my private reasoning, I must here declare that, though it has been my labour, for clearness' sake, to bring this variety of questions to the foregoing rules, yet that

the main substance of this Essay was suggested by that man of peace, the learned and industrious Grotius, who, having fully examined into the occasions of the Reformation, gave his judgment of them, and plainly discovered even so long ago that he thought the difference between the Church of Rome and the Reformed Churches not to be greater than I have here hinted, and consequently that an accommodation was very possible, if the difficulty were not greater from the indisposition of men's minds than from the real debates that are between them. Hear it in his own words, as translated and printed out of his *Vote for the Church's Peace*.

"I observed," says he, "(1) that by the schoolmen (more skilful in Aristotle's philosophy than in the holy Scripture, and those ancient writers that illustrated Christian religion, both in Greek and Latin) many doctrines were introduced by a certain liberty of argumentation, not by authority of universal Councils; (2) that the doctrines established in the Councils were not by the schoolmen commodiously explained; (3) that amongst the prelates of the Church, such pride and avarice and ill manners had prevailed, that they were not solicitous, neither to inculcate those good doctrines to the people, as was fit, nor to correct the vices of the people, but took advantage, and made a gain of the people's ignorance and of their superstition, the daughter of ignorance and nurse of vices; (4) that ancient doctrine, being thus overclouded, partly appeared not, partly, being discoloured, seemed other than it was. Then judged I, that this was the

cause why there was many ages since desired a reformation, that is a repurgation of doctrine, both from the scholastic trifles and disputes, and from those mists which overshadowed it: and why at last (the public complaints of kings and learned men having been long in vain) some kings, ill used by some of the Popes, and elsewhere private persons, set themselves about such a reformation as they could devise. But yet this had not the desired success, for in several places were framed several confessions, and contradictory; and not only the parties that were made could never close, but also new little parties sprung up every day, so many that none can number them. Yea, credible it is that new will arise perpetually, so fruitful is the matter and occasion of them.”¹

Now, whoever will reflect upon this short relation, must observe three principal occasions for undertaking the Reformation:—1. Extravagant school opinions. 2. The doctrines of General Councils not commodiously explained by schoolmen. 3. The pride, avarice, and neglect of the prelates of the Church of Rome. By which three means the doctrine of the Church partly was overclouded, and partly it appeared other than it was. Hence a Reformation was desired; and what was this Reformation to be? A repurgation of doctrine from the “scholastic trifles,” and from “the mists that overshadowed it.” This is the judgment of this great man, who had spent so many years in examining into this matter. And now, in his judgment, what is the real difference between the Church of

¹ [*Votum pro Pace, ad init.*]

Rome and the Reformed Churches? The only difference is in school opinions, incommodious explanations, and the disedifying lives of the prelates.

But it is not by this learned foreigner only is given hopes of an accommodation; for I have found encouragement at home, both from our own Church and likewise from Dissenters. I name here only one, to represent each party, viz., Archbishop Bramhall for the Church, and Mr. Baxter for the Dissenters. The former I find thus cited, and in these words making his declaration: "A great many of these controversies, which raised the highest animosities among Christians at the first Reformation, are laid aside by moderate and judicious persons of both parties, without any miracle, and are kept on foot by some blunderers who follow the old mode, when the fashion is grown out of date, either out of prejudice, or pride, or want of judgment, or all together. And as many controversies of the greatest magnitude are already as good as reconciled, so more may be. There is no opposition to be made against their evident truth."

And Mr. Baxter thus, in his Life, penned by himself: "My censures of the Papists do much differ from what they were at first. I then thought that their errors in the doctrines of Faith were their most dangerous mistakes; as in the points of merits, justification by works, assurance of salvation, the nature of faith, etc. But now I am assured that their misexpressions, and misunderstandings of us, with our mistakings of them, and inconvenient expressing our opinions, hath made the difference in these points to

appear much greater than they are, and that in some of them it is next to none at all. But the great and unreconcilable differences lie in their Church tyranny and usurpations, and in their great corruptions and abasement of God's worship, together with their be-friending ignorance and vice. At first I thought that Mr. Perkins well proved that a Papist cannot go beyond a reprobate ; but now I doubt not but God hath many sanctified ones amongst them, who have received the doctrine of Christianity so practically, that their contradictory errors prevail not against them, to hinder their love of God and their salvation. Alas ! at first, it would disgrace any doctrine with me, if I did but hear it called Popery and Antichristian, but I have long learned to be more impartial, and to dislike men for bad doctrine, rather than the doctrine for the men, and to know that Satan can use even the names of Popery and Antichrist against the truth."

Thus these two speak their minds, who having taken great pains in inquiring into this whole matter, as appears in their works, must be allowed as well qualified for giving their information. The former says that many of the greatest controversies are already as good as reconciled by the judicious, though not by blunderers, and that more may be ; what better encouragement for this Essay ?

The other, whose either learning, or piety, or industry is not suspected by any Dissenter, says that a great part of the difference between the Papists and Reformed is not *in doctrines of faith*, but *mis-expressions, misunderstandings, mistakes, and inconvenient*

expressions on both sides ; and can then any Dissenter think this sufficient cause for a schism between Churches ? And as for those differences which he says are great and irreconcilable, viz., Church-tyranny, usurpations, these, upon inquiry, seem to be chiefly differences of the Court of Rome and not of the Church, since, as it is evident from what has been said above, the communion with that Church nowhere obliges its members to assent to, or even approve, such tyranny or usurpations, or anything that is befriending vice or error ; but they are at as full liberty of disapproving them as we who are not of that Church. So that the account being duly made up, there seems, according to Mr. Baxter's scheme, not many differences remaining to be reconciled, especially of those which he calls unreconcilable ; for though they are certainly such to which we can never be reconciled, yet so they are likewise to infinite numbers within the Church of Rome, who can no more be reconciled with them than we, but with us are constant opposers of them.

And here now I cannot but express my great surprise at the Romanists here in this nation ; for, whereas they may renounce all that tyranny and usurpation, all the encroachments of the Pontificate and the unlimited supremacy, with all those other principles and practices which are points that render them obnoxious to the Government ; whereas, I say, they may do this without injury to their profession of faith, or any one term of their communion, they stand still and suffer both in their persons and estates, and in the most infamous character cast upon their Church, as the

teacher of such detestable doctrines, without ever once endeavouring to justify themselves to the State, or clearing themselves or the Church from the scandal of such doctrines.

This is a matter of surprise to me, and seems (they will give me leave to tell them so) a great folly in them. For, though to suffer peaceably for their faith be commendable, and what they esteem the part of a confessor or martyr, yet to suffer for school opinions, for the divinity of Bellarmine, or in compliment to the Court of Rome (such as are all the points above), is what may give them a title to humour or madness, but never to any recompence in heaven, since God has nowhere engaged His word to be the rewarder of such suffering. And what is the occasion of their being distinguished by the severity of penalties from all other bodies of Christians but these very points? Can they imagine the State is so averse to their speculative doctrines, as, upon this score only, to prosecute them with so many penal statutes? Do not they see all manner of speculative opinions are tolerated by law, and even such as seem levelled against Christianity? And can they think then that their speculations are the occasion of their suffering? Such great partiality in speculatives cannot reasonably be supposed, especially in persons who express so great a compassion to tender consciences, and disapprove persecution upon the sole score of religion. Upon which consideration the inference seems rational, that, if they had a mind no longer to be Bellarmine's martyrs nor confessors for school opinions, but give

the State security of never abetting such pernicious principles,¹ they might hope to come in with their speculations, and have a share of that favour which is shown to Jews, Quakers, and Socinians, and not fear extirpation upon the account of harmless religious notions.

And this they may do, for they know those inflaming doctrines are no part of their faith, neither does their Church anywhere enjoin an assent to them; nay, they know these very principles are opposed by firm members of their own Communion, and in practice resolutely withstood. Why then do they stand still and suffer on this account, and by their silence give occasion to the whole nation of believing their Church to be so infamous as to teach such doctrines, and that as many as are in its communion are bound to receive them? This silence I cannot understand. But not to exceed in this digression, I return, and conclude with this wish, that our present generation, both divines and others, would have some regard to the deliberate judgment of the learned, who have given such encouragement to this present Essay, and to the method of a Catholic peace. I cannot pretend those I have mentioned through this little work to be exempt from error, but I can say they were men of as great learning, sound judgment, and eminent piety as our Church has ever brought forth; and having with a particular industry applied their labours to the study of the

¹ The Roman Catholics of England and Ireland have lately, agreeable to Act of Parliament, given a full and solemn test of their abhorrence of such pernicious principles, as well as of their allegiance and attachment to the King and Civil Constitution of their country.

ancient Fathers and primitive Christianity, they must be allowed the best qualified to speak in this point. It is not then an ill name, or flinging dirt at them (the prevailing arms of passion, ignorance, and prejudice), is enough to overthrow their evidence; but this ought to be revered, till there appears a different account from some others, who have a more certain insight into the apostolic times. And who are these? Under the authority then of these great and learned men I take shelter against all reproaches, but with much more comfort under the blessing of *Beati pacifici*, "Blessed are the peacemakers;" while I seek nothing but the cure of schism and the blessing of peace.

APPENDIX A.

(See *Introduction*, pp. 38, *sqq.*)

THE following is the full text of Bishop Doyle's *Letter on the Union of the Churches*, addressed to Mr. Robinson, Chancellor of the Exchequer (afterwards Lord Ripon), under date May 13, 1824, and published in the *Dublin Evening Post* of May 22 :—

“SIR,—The sentiments which you are reported to have delivered in the House of Commons on the motion of Mr. Hume, relative to the Church Establishment in this country, induce me, though a stranger, to take the liberty of addressing you; and as I agree in opinion with you that the best if not the only effectual mode of pacifying Ireland, improving the condition of her people, and consolidating the interests of the Empire, would be found in a union of *the Churches which distract and divide us*, an expression of my views, who am a Catholic Bishop, may not be unacceptable to you.

“A person well acquainted with Ireland would not find it difficult to show why the efforts lately made to better her condition have been fruitless, and why every benefit conferred on her by the Legislature, or through the bounty of the English people, has had no corresponding effect. The whole frame of society amongst us is disorganised, and the distrust, apathy, fraud, jealousy, and contention which prevail universally, as they derange the public will, and prevent the mutual co-operation of all classes, must necessarily prevent the country, whilst they continue, from deriving advantage from any partial measure, or emerging from its present depressed, if not degraded, condition.

“ This state of the public mind and feeling is unquestionably produced by the inequality of the laws, and still more immediately by the incessant collision and conflict of religious opinions.

“ The *Irish Parliament* excluded and continued to exclude the British Constitution from the great mass of our people ; first, through bigotry and a fear of the Pretender ; afterwards through the less worthy motives of religious intolerance and selfish monopoly ; *that Parliament is now happily extinguished*, and the present Legislature can have no other motive for continuing the ancient system than a desire to preserve the integrity of the Empire, which it fears would be endangered if a nation, with a people and resources such as ours, were united, rich, and powerful.

“ Such considerations should, doubtless, have their weight with a statesman, and there is no man holding the helm of British interests who might not with reason hesitate as to the propriety of the course which he should proceed in with regard to Ireland. But the Government, Parliament, and all the reflecting portion of both countries agree in thinking, that the state of Ireland is intolerable, and that a material change must be effected in her condition. How this change can be produced no man is prepared to say with confidence ; but the apparent impossibility of discovering an adequate remedy for the inveterate and almost incurable diseases under which we labour, may in the end be the cause of applying to us the most, if not the only, effectual cure.

“ One of the principal Secretaries of State has said, in his place in Parliament, that every means of tranquillising Ireland had been tried, Catholic Emancipation alone excepted, and to that measure he was not then prepared to yield his assent. The head of the Government, in the Upper House, has deliberately declared, that, in his opinion, the admission of the Roman Catholics to the privileges of the Constitution would

only aggravate the evils of the country. These personages are manifestly at a loss how to conduct the interests of Ireland. They must be aware that the whole body of the Catholics are impatient, that their pride and interests are wounded, that disaffection must be working within them, if they be men born and nurtured in a free State, and yet enslaved. These Ministers of the Crown must know that the mind of a nation, fettered and exasperated, will struggle and bound, and when a chasm is opened, will escape by it in a torrent like lava from the crater of a volcano.

“They must see the rising greatness of France, and of the United States; the growing empires in South America; the character of those wars which are approaching, as well as the dispositions of six millions of the King’s subjects; and they must have their misgivings as to whether they will be able to weather the coming storm. They are themselves preparing fuel for the flame in Ireland; they are educating the people without providing for their distress, and thus putting the sharpest weapons into the hands of men, who, as they learn to read, will also learn to calculate their strength, and to devise and meditate on schemes of retaliation and revenge. They will not pacify the country, or induce the absentees to return, or the resident gentry to abide here in peace; by and by there will be no link of connection between the Government and a zealous if not a disaffected people. The ministers of the Establishment, as it exists at present, are and will be detested by those who differ from them in religion, and the more their residence is enforced and their number multiplied the more odious they will become. This may seem a paradox in England, but whosoever is acquainted with the oppression arising from Tithes and Church Rates, and with the excessive religious zeal which has always characterised the Irish, will freely assent to this truth, however strange it may appear; I doubt as little of it as any other I have stated.

“The minister of England cannot look to the exertions of the Catholic priesthood; they have been ill-treated, and they may yield for a moment to the influence of nature, though it be opposed to grace. This Clergy, with few exceptions, are from the ranks of the people, they inherit their feelings, they are not, as formerly, brought up under despotic Governments, and *they have imbibed the doctrines of Locke and Paley more deeply than those of Bellarmine, or even of Bossuet, on the divine right of kings; they know much more of the principles of the Constitution than they do of passive obedience.* If a rebellion were raging from Carrickfergus to Cape Clear, no sentence of excommunication would ever be fulminated by a Catholic prelate, or, if fulminated, it would fall, as Grattan once said of British supremacy, like a spent thunderbolt, ‘some gazed at it, the people were found to touch it.’

“The Catholics, possessed of property in Ireland, either cannot or will not render efficient services to the Government, should eventful times arrive. The number of the ancient proprietors of land amongst the Catholics has of late years rather diminished than increased, and those who remain of them have at present less influence than at any former period of our history. The system of clanship is entirely dissolved in Ireland, *the Catholic Aristocracy, as they are called, since the Penal Laws were relaxed, have gradually withdrawn themselves from the people; they have shown on some occasions an over-weening anxiety for Emancipation, at the expense of what the Priesthood and the other classes deemed the interests, if not the principles, of their religion;* hence they are looked on with suspicion, and can no longer wield the public mind. The men who have purchased properties in land—who have lent their money, acquired by industry, on mortgages, those who are engaged in commerce, or in the liberal professions, are, with a few silly exceptions, on the side of the people. These are men of literature or of trade, and, therefore, if history and

experience can be credited, they are bold, ambitious, fond of justice and of freedom—from such men the Government, should it persist in its present course, has only to expect defiance or open hostility.

“Such is the view which this country must present to the eye of a British statesman, and when he turns from it and says he knows not what to do, he professes his incompetency to guide the public councils.

“In such a state of things it behoves Parliament to apply to itself what the Roman Senate used to say to the Consul or Dictator in times of peril, *Curet, ne quid respublica detrimenti patiatur*, and I have little doubt, if your sentiments were adopted by it, but that Ireland could be tranquillised, the union of the countries cemented, peace and prosperity diffused, and the Empire rendered invulnerable.

“These results cannot be attained by Catholic Emancipation alone, still less by those futile measures which are now in progress; if the mind of the nation be not well directed, and the public will made to co-operate with the Legislature, the disease may be repressed or shifted, but no renovating principle of health will be infused into the frame of society.

“Catholic Emancipation will not remedy the evils of the Tithe system, it will not allay the fervour of religious zeal—the perpetual clashing of *two Churches, one elevated, the other fallen, both high-minded, perhaps intolerant*; it will not check the rancorous animosities with which different sects assail each other; it will not remove all suspicion of partiality in the Government, were Antoninus himself the Viceroy; it will not create that sympathy between the different orders in the State, which is ever mainly dependent on religion, nor produce that unlimited confidence between man and man which is the strongest foundation on which public welfare can repose, as well as the most certain pledge of a nation's prosperity. Withal, Catholic Emancipation is a great public measure, and of itself

not only would effect much, but open a passage to ulterior measures, which a provident Legislature could without difficulty effect.

“ *The Union of the Churches, however, which you have had the singular merit of suggesting to the Commons of the United Kingdom, would together and at once effect a total change in the dispositions of men ; it would bring all classes to co-operate zealously in promoting the prosperity of Ireland, and in securing her allegiance for ever to the British Throne. The question of Emancipation would be swallowed up in the great inquiry, how Ireland could be enriched and strengthened ; and in place of the Prime Minister devising arguments to screen an odious oppression, and reconcile an Insurrection Act of five-and-twenty years’ duration with the Habeas Corpus Act and Magna Charta, we would find him receiving the plaudits of the Senate, and the thanks of his Sovereign, and the blessings of millions, for the favours which he could so easily dispense.*

“ This Union, on which so much depends, is not, as you have justly observed, so difficult as appears to many ; and the present time is peculiarly well calculated for attempting, at least, to carry it into effect.

“ It is not difficult ; for in the discussions which were held, and the correspondence which occurred on this subject early in the last century, as well that in which Archbishop Wake was engaged, as the others which were carried on between Bossuet and Leibnitz, it appeared that *the points of agreement between the Churches were numerous, those on which the parties hesitated few, and apparently not the most important.* The effort which was then made was not attended with success, but its failure was owing more to Princes than to Priests, more to State policy than to a difference of belief. But the same reasons which at that period disappointed the hopes of every good Christian in Europe would at present operate favourably. For what interest can England *now* have which is opposed to

such a Union, and what nation or Church in the universe can have stronger motives for desiring it than Great Britain, if by it she could preserve her Church Establishment, perfect her internal policy, and secure her external dominion ?

"The time is favourable, for the Government is powerful and at peace ; the Pope is powerless and anxious to conciliate ; the Irish Catholics are wearied and fatigued, exceedingly desirous of repose ; the Established Religion is almost frittered away, and the Monarchy, a thing unprecedented in a Christian State, is left in one country with only the staff of the Church, to use an expression of Mr. Hume, and in the other with less than a moiety of the people attached to the Hierarchy. Add to this the improvement in men's minds during the last century, the light and liberality which distinguish the present, the revival of Christian piety since the overthrow of the French Revolution, and the disposition of even religious disputants to conciliate and explain.

"In Ireland, I am confident that, notwithstanding the ferment which now prevails, a proposition such as you have made, if adopted by Government, would be heartily embraced. The clergy of the Establishment are unpopular, and they feel it ; they are without flocks, and every professional man wishes for employment ; their property is attacked, and even endangered, for the State has touched it, and the people have no respect for it. The Dissenters have encroached on them ; and the Catholic clergy have despoiled them in many places of their flocks. The Catholic laity, as I before mentioned, are tired of their degradation ; they are wearied in pursuit of freedom ; they love their country, and are anxious for repose. Their Clergy, without, I believe, an exception, would make every possible sacrifice to effect a Union ; I myself would most cheerfully, and without fee, pension, emolument, or hope, resign the office which I hold, if by doing so I could in any way contribute to the union of my brethren and the happiness of my country.

“The proprietors and capitalists in Ireland are affected at the prospect which lies before them, and are, if not blind to self-interest as well as dead to patriotism, anxious to establish peace and security amongst us. The Government has no interest in preserving disunion, unless for the purpose of securing its power, and should it find an honourable and safe substitute for so detestable and precarious a system, it would be blind and besotted if it did not embrace it.

“The King who rules over us is liberal, wise, and enlightened, beyond any of his predecessors ; and as he is the head of the State, so *he has been foremost through life in bestowing his Royal countenance and support on whatever could contribute to the honour of Religion*, to the good of his subjects, or to the glory of his reign. Whatever, then, time and circumstances can contribute to a great and good undertaking seems now to favour a project for the union of Christians too long divided. Had they been so favourable in the sixteenth century, the separation which has produced such numberless calamities would certainly have been prevented.

“It may not become so humble an individual as I am to hint even at a plan for effecting so great a purpose as the union of Catholics and Protestants in one great family of Christians ; but as the difficulty does not appear to me to be at all proportioned to the magnitude of the object to be attained, I would presume to state that, if Protestant and Catholic divines of learning and a conciliatory character were summoned by the Crown to ascertain the points of agreement and difference between the Churches, and that the results of their conferences were made the basis of a project to be treated on between the heads of the Church of Rome and of England, the result might be more favourable than at present would be anticipated.

“The chief points to be discussed are the *Canon of the S. Scriptures, Faith, Justification, the Mass, the Sacraments, the Authority of Tradition, of Councils, of the Pope, the Celibacy of*

the Clergy, Language of the Liturgy, Invocation of Saints, Respect for Images, Prayers for the Dead.

"On most of these it appears to me that there is no essential difference between the Catholics and Protestants; the existing diversity of opinion arises, in most cases, from certain forms of words which admit of satisfactory explanation, or from the ignorance or misconceptions which ancient prejudice and ill-will produce and strengthen, but which could be removed; they are pride and points of honour which keep us divided on many subjects, not a love of Christian humility, charity, and truth.

"It should be the duty, as it is obviously the interest of the ruling powers, to provide for the happiness of the people by enlightening their minds and by curbing their passions; not by reproachful speeches and coercive laws, but by means suited to their real wants; and if, through the wisdom of Parliament and the efforts of Government, the Churches of these countries could be united, a new era of happiness would commence in our history. The laws in this country could be equalised, the most perfect confidence would prevail between the Government and the subjects; their natural protectors would be restored to a generous and warm-hearted people; the aristocracy would become what it never has been in Ireland—a link between the prince and the peasant: industry would be protected; capital would flow into the country; all the resources of the soil, climate, genius, and talent of the nation would be called into life and activity; the union of the countries would be consolidated, and Great Britain would not only be Queen of the ocean but Mistress of the world.

"Hoping that you will again call the attention of Parliament to the consideration of this important subject, I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient humble servant,

"✠ J. DOYLE."

APPENDIX B.

(See Introduction, p. 46.)

THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM.

*Established September 8th, 1857. Feast of the Nativity of
the Blessed Virgin Mary.*

AN Association has been formed under the above title, to unite in a bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions. It is hoped and believed that many, however widely separated at present in their religious convictions, who deplore the grievous scandal to unbelievers, and the hindrance to the promotion of truth and holiness among Christians, caused by the unhappy divisions existing amongst those who profess to have "One LORD, One Faith, One Baptism," will recognise the consequent duty of joining their intercession to the Redeemer's dying prayer, "that they all may be One, as Thou, FATHER, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be One in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." To all then, who, while they lament the divisions among Christians, look forward for their healing mainly to a Corporate Reunion of those three great bodies which claim for themselves the inheritance of the Priesthood and the name of Catholic, an appeal is made. They are not asked to compromise any principle which they rightly or wrongly hold dear. They are simply asked to unite for the promotion of a high and holy

end, in reliance on the promise of our Divine LORD, that "whatsoever we shall ask in prayer, believing, we shall receive;" and that, "if two or three shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of My FATHER Who is in Heaven." The daily use of a short form of prayer, together with one "OUR FATHER"—for the intention of the Association—is the only obligation incurred by those who join it; to which is added, in the case of priests, the offering, at least once in three months, of the Holy Sacrifice, for the same intention.

FORM OF PRAYER.

O LORD JESU CHRIST, Who saidst unto Thine Apostles, Peace I leave with you; My Peace I give unto you; regard not my sins, but the faith of Thy Church; and grant her that Peace and Unity which is agreeable to Thy Will, Who livest and reignest God for ever and ever. Amen.

OUR FATHER, &c.

NOTE.—In joining the Association no one is understood as thereby expressing an opinion on any matter which may be deemed one of controversy, or on any religious question except that the object of the Association is desirable.



BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

LECTURES on the REUNION of the CHURCHES.

Translated, with Preface, from the German of J. I. VON DÜLLINGER,
D.D., D.C.L. 5s.

RECOLLECTIONS OF OBER-AMMERGAU in 1871.

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

RIVINGTONS:

LONDON, OXFORD, AND CAMBRIDGE.

THE FIRST AGE OF CHRISTIANITY and the

CHURCH. Translated from the German of J. I. VON DÜLLINGER,
D.D., D.C.L. Third Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 21s.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE of the ATONEMENT.

An Historical Inquiry into its Development in the Church, with an
Introduction on the Principle of Theological Developments. Second
Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

CATHOLIC ESCHATOLOGY and UNIVERSALISM.

An Essay on the Doctrine of Future Retribution. Second Edition,
Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo. 6s.

LONDON: W. H. ALLEN & Co., 13 Waterloo Place.

DR. PUSEY'S EIRENICON CONSIDERED in RELA-

TION to CATHOLIC UNITY. A Letter to the Rev. Father LOCK-
HART. Second Edition. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

POEMS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LONDON: R. WASHBOURNE, 18A Paternoster Row.

HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS of THE CHURCH.

Vol. II., translated from the German of C. J. HEFELE, D.D., Bishop
of Rottenburg. 12s.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK.



NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS

IN COURSE OF PUBLICATION BY

MESSRS. RIVINGTON

WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON

And at Oxford and Cambridge

October 1878

The Annotated Bible, being a House-

hold Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures, comprehending the Results of Modern Discovery and Criticism. By the Rev. **John Henry Blunt**, M.A., F.S.A., Editor of "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," "The Dictionary of Theology," etc. etc.

Three Vols. Demy 4to, with Maps, etc.

VOL. I. (668 pages.)—Containing the GENERAL INTRODUCTION, with Text and Annotations on the Books from GENESIS to ESTHER. 31s. 6d.

VOL. II. (720 pages.)—Completing the OLD TESTAMENT and APOCRYPHA. [January 1879.]

VOL. III.—Containing the NEW TESTAMENT and GENERAL INDEX. [In the Press.]

The Theory of Development. A Criti-

cism of Dr. Newman's Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, reprinted from "The Christian Remembrancer," January 1847. By **J. B. Mozley**, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

Crown 8vo. 5s.

Essays, Historical and Theological.

By **J. B. Mozley**, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

Two Vols. 8vo. 24s.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Studies, Critical and Devotional, on the

Collects of the Communion Office. By **Edward Meyrick Goulburn**, D.D.,
Dean of Norwich.

Two Vols. Crown 8vo.

[*In the Press.*]

Selection, adapted to the Seasons of

the Ecclesiastical Year, from the "Parochial and Plain Sermons" of **John Henry Newman**, B.D., sometime Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. Edited by
the Rev. **W. J. Copeland**, B.D., Rector of Farnham, Essex.

Crown 8vo. 5s.

An Introduction to the Devotional

Study of the Holy Scriptures: with a Prefatory Essay on their Inspiration,
and specimens of Meditations on various passages of them. By **Edward
Meyrick Goulburn**, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

Tenth Edition, revised and enlarged. Small 8vo. 6s. 6d.

An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Cen-

tury. Proposal for Catholic Communion. By a Minister of the Church of
England. Edited by **Henry Nutcombe Oxenham**, M.A., Author of
"Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon Considered in Relation to Catholic Unity," etc.

New Edition. With Introduction, Appendices, and Notes. 8vo.

Sermons Preached in the Temporary

Chapel of Keble College, Oxford, 1870—1876.

Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Rudiments of Theology. A First Book for

Students. By **John Pilkington Norris**, B.D., Canon of Bristol, Vicar of
St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Man-
chester, Author of "Key to the Four Gospels," "Key to the Acts of the
Apostles," &c.

Second Edition, revised. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Daily Gleanings of the Saintly Life.

Compiled by **C. M. S.**, with an Introduction by the Rev. **M. F. Sadler**,
M.A., Prebendary of Wells, and Rector of Honiton, Devon.

Small 8vo.

[*In the Press.*]

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

For Days and Years. A Book containing

a Text, Short Reading, and Hymn for every Day in the Church's Year.
Selected by **H. L. Sidney Lear**.

16mo. 2s. 6d.

The Microscope of the New Testa-

ment. By the late Rev. **William Sewell**, D.D., formerly Fellow of Exeter College, sometime Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford, and Whitehall Preacher. Edited by the Rev. **W. J. Crichton**, M.A.

8vo. 14s.

Sunday Evenings in the Family.

Being Expositions of the Gospels and Articles of the Church of England.

Small 8vo.

[In the Press.]

Analytical Notes on Obadiah and

Habakuk, for the use of Hebrew Students. By the Rev. **William Randolph**, M.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge.

8vo. 5s. 6d.

The Orthodox Doctrine of the Church of

England explained in a Commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles. By the Rev. **T. I. Ball**. With an Introduction by the Rev. **W. J. E. Bennett**, M.A., Vicar of Frome-Selwood.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A Manual of Private Devotions. Com-

piled principally from the works of Jeremy Taylor and Bishop Andrewes.

Small 8vo. 2s.

The Guide of Life: a Manual of Prayers

for Women; with the Office of the Holy Communion, and Devotions. By **C. E. Skinner**. Edited by the Rev. **John Hewett**, M.A., Vicar of Babbacombe, Devon.

Crown 16mo. 2s. 6d.

Easy Lessons addressed to Candidates

for Confirmation. By **John P. Norris**, B.D., Canon of Bristol, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester, and Vicar of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, Author of "Rudiments of Theology."

18mo. 1s. 6d.

The Christian Year: Thoughts in Verse

for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year.

*New Edition printed in large type. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.**The Devotional Birthday Book.* Form-

ing a New Volume of "Rivingtons' Devotional Series."

18mo. 2s. 6d.

[In the Press.]

Ruling Ideas in Early Ages and their

Relation to Old Testament Faith. Lectures delivered to Graduates of the University of Oxford. By J. B. Mozley, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

*Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.**Sermons Preached before the Univer-*

sity of Oxford, and on Various Occasions. By J. B. Mozley, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

*Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.**Christian Biographies.* By H. L.

Sidney Lear.

MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE, Daughter of Louis XV., known also as the Mother T  r  se de S. Augustin.

A DOMINICAN ARTIST: a Sketch of the Life of the Rev. P  re Besson, of the Order of S. Dominic.

HENRI PERREYVE. By A. Gratry. Translated by special permission. With Portrait.

S. FRANCIS DE SALES, Bishop and Prince of Geneva.

THE REVIVAL OF PRIESTLY LIFE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN FRANCE. Charles de Condren—S. Philip Neri and Cardinal de Berulle—S. Vincent de Paul—Saint Sulpice and Jean Jacques Olier.

A CHRISTIAN PAINTER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: being the Life of Hippolyte Flandrin.

BOSSUET AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

F  NELON, ARCHBISHOP OF CAMBRAI.

New and Uniform Editions. Eight Volumes. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Sold separately. Or the Eight Volumes may be had in a Box, 31s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

A Selection from Pascal's Thoughts.

Translated by H. L. Sidney Lear.

*Square 16mo. Printed on Dutch hand-made paper. 3s. 6d.**The Priest to the Altar; or, Aids*

to the Devout Celebration of Holy Communion, chiefly after the Ancient English Use of Sarum.

*Third Edition, revised and enlarged. Royal 8vo. [In the Press.]**The Armoury of Prayer.* A Book ofDevotion. Compiled by **Berdmore Compton**, Vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street.*18mo. 3s. 6d.**The Child Samuel.* A Practical and De-votional Commentary on the Birth and Childhood of the Prophet Samuel, as recorded in 1 Sam. i., ii. 1—27, iii. Designed as a Help to Meditation on the Holy Scriptures for Children and Young Persons. By **Edward Meyrick Goulburn**, D.D., Dean of Norwich.*Small 8vo. 5s.**Thoughts on Personal Religion; being a*Treatise on the Christian Life in its Two Chief Elements, Devotion and Practice. By **Edward Meyrick Goulburn**, D.D., Dean of Norwich.*New Presentation Edition, elegantly printed on Toned Paper.**Two Vols. Small 8vo. 10s. 6d.**An Edition in one Vol., 6s. 6d.; also a Cheap Edition, 3s. 6d.**The Greek Testament.* With a CriticallyRevised Text; a Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. For the use of Theological Students and Ministers. By **Henry Alford**, D.D., late Dean of Canterbury.*New Edition. Four Volumes. 8vo. 102s.*

The Volumes are sold separately, as follows:—

Vol. I.—THE FOUR GOSPELS. 28s.

Vol. II.—ACTS TO II. CORINTHIANS. 24s.

Vol. III.—GALATIANS TO PHILEMON. 18s.

Vol. IV.—HEBREWS TO REVELATION. 32s.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Miscellanies, Literary and Religious.

By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln.

Two Vols. 8vo.

[In the Press.]

The Doctrine of the Cross: specially

in its relation to the Troubles of Life. Sermons preached during Lent in the Parish Church of New Windsor by Henry J. Ellison, M.A. (sometime Vicar of Windsor), Honorary Chaplain to the Queen, Honorary Canon of Christ Church, and Rector of Haseley, Oxon.

Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A Catechism on Gospel History, incul-

cating Church Doctrine. By the Rev. Samuel Kettlewell, M.A., late Vicar of S. Mark's, Leeds.

Third Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Authorship of the "De Imitatione

Christi." With many interesting particulars about the Book. By Samuel Kettlewell, M.A., late Vicar of St. Mark's, Leeds. Containing Photographic Engravings of the "De Imitatione" written by Thomas à Kempis, 1441, and of two other MSS.

8vo. 14s.

A Manual of Devotion, chiefly for the

use of Schoolboys. By William Baker, D.D., Head-Master of Merchant Taylors' School. With Preface by J. R. Woodford, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ely.

Crown 16mo. 1s. 6d.

Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesi-

astical Parties, and Schools of Religious Thought. By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. John Henry Blunt, M.A., F.S.A., Editor of the "Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology" and the "Annotated Book of Common Prayer," &c. &c.

Imperial 8vo, 36s. In half-morocco, 48s.

Sermons on the Church's Seasons; Ad-

vent to Whitsun Day. By John Webster Parker, M.A., late Vicar of St. Albans, Rochdale. With Introduction by the Lord Bishop of Manchester.

Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Genesis. With Notes. By the Rev. G. V. Garland, M.A., late Vicar of Aslacton, Norfolk. [The Hebrew Text, with Literal Translation.]
8vo. 21s.

The Knight of Intercession, and other
Poems. By the Rev. S. J. Stone, M.A., Pembroke College, Oxford; Vicar of S. Paul's, Haggerston.
Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. Crown 8vo. 6s.

Morning Notes of Praise. A Series of
Morning Meditations upon the Psalms. Dedicated to the Countess of Cottenham. By Lady Charlotte-Maria Pepys.
New Edition. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Quiet Moments; a Four Weeks' Course
of Thoughts and Meditations before Evening Prayer and at Sunset. By Lady Charlotte-Maria Pepys,
New Edition. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Twenty-one Years in S. George's Mission.
An Account of its Origin, Progress, and Work of Charity. With an Appendix. By the Rev. C. F. Lowder, M.A., Vicar of S. Peter's, London Docks.
Crown 8vo. 6s.

The Young Churchman's Companion to
the Prayer Book. By the Rev. J. W. Gedge, M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Archdeaconry of Surrey.
Part I.—MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER AND LITANY.
Part II.—BAPTISMAL AND CONFIRMATION SERVICES.
Part III.—THE OFFICE OF HOLY COMMUNION.
18mo, 1s. each; or in paper Cover, 6d.

The Life of Worship. A Course of Lectures. By the Rev. George Body, B.A., Rector of Kirkby Misperton, Author of "The Life of Temptation" and "The Life of Justification."
Crown 8vo. [In the Press.]

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

The Words of the SON of GOD, taken

from the Four Gospels, and arranged for Daily Meditation throughout the Year. By ELEANOR PLUMPTRE.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Our Work for CHRIST among His

Suffering People. A Book for Hospital Nurses. By M. A. MORRELL.

Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A Dictionary of English Philosophical

Terms. By the Rev. FRANCIS GARDEN, M.A., Professor of Theology and Rhetoric at Queen's College, London, and Sub-Dean of Her Majesty's Chapels-Royal.

Small 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Religion of the Christ; its Historic

and Literary Development considered as an Evidence of its Origin. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1874. By the Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, M.A., Minister of St. Philip's, Regent Street, and Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London.

Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Reformation of the Church of

England; its History, Principles, and Results. A.D. 1514-1547. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A., F.S.A., Editor of "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," and "The Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology," &c. &c.

Fourth Edition. 8vo. 16s.

The Mystery of Christ: Being an Examination

of the Doctrines contained in the first three Chapters of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Ephesians. By GEORGE STAUNTON BARROW, M.A., Vicar of Stowmarket.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Prayer Book Interleaved. With

Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes, arranged parallel to the Text. By the Rev. W. M. CAMPION, D.D., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, and Rector of St. Botolph's; and the Rev. W. J. BEAMONT, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. With a Preface by the Lord Bishop of Winchester.

Ninth Edition. Small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Apostolical Succession in the Church

of England. By **Arthur W. Haddan**, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath, late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

New Edition. 8vo. 12s.

Sermons Preached in the Parish Church

of Barnes, 1871—1876. By **Peter Goldsmith Medd**, M.A., Rector of North Cerney, Hon. Canon of St. Albans, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop; late Senior Fellow of University College, Oxford, and Rector of Barnes.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Mystery of the Temptation: a Course

of Lectures. By the Rev. **W. H. Hutchings**, M.A., Sub-Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer.

Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Life of Justification: a Series of Lec-

tures delivered in Substance at All Saints', Margaret Street. By the Rev. **George Body**, B.A., Rector of Kirkby Misperton.

Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

The Life of Temptation: a Course of Lec-

tures delivered in Substance at S. Peter's, Eaton Square; also at All Saints', Margaret Street. By the Rev. **George Body**, B.A., Rector of Kirkby Misperton.

Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Words to take with Us: a Manual of

Daily and Occasional Prayers, for Private and Common Use. With Plain Instructions and Counsels on Prayer. By **W. E. Scudamore**, M.A., Rector of Ditchingham, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Fourth Edition. Small 8vo. 2s. 6d.

The Book of Church Law; Being an Ex-

position of the Legal Rights and Duties of the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England. By the Rev. **John Henry Blunt**, M.A., F.S.A. Revised by **Walter G. F. Phillimore**, D.C.L., Barrister-at-Law, and Chancellor of the Diocese of Lincoln.

Second Edition, revised. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

An Introduction to the Study of

Painted Glass. By A. A.

*Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.**Spiritual Letters to Men, by Archbishop*

Fénelon. By the Author of "Life of S. Francis de Sales," "Life of Fénelon," &c.

*Crown 8vo. 6s.**Spiritual Letters to Women, by Arch-*

bishop Fénelon. By the Author of "Life of S. Francis de Sales," "Life of Fénelon," &c.

*Crown 8vo. 6s.**Sacred Allegories. The Shadow of the*Cross—The Distant Hills—The Old Man's Home—The King's Messengers.
By the Rev. W. Adams, M.A., late Fellow of Merton College, Oxford.*With numerous Illustrations.**New Edition. One Vol. Crown 8vo. 5s.**The four Allegories separately. 16mo. 1s. each.**The Origin and Development of Reli-*

gious Belief. By the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M.A., Author of "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages," &c.

New Edition. Two Volumes. Crown 8vo. 6s. each. Sold separately.

Vol. I.—MONOTHEISM and POLYTHEISM.

Vol. II.—CHRISTIANITY.

Prayers and Meditations for the Holy

Communion. By Josephine Fletcher. With a Preface by C. J. Ellicott, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

*With Rubrics in red. Royal 32mo. 2s. 6d.**Cheap Edition. 32mo, cloth limp, 1s.**Lectures delivered at St. Margaret's,*

Lothbury. By the Rev. Henry Melvill, B.D., late Canon of St. Paul's, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

New Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Pleadings for Christ. Being Sermons,

Doctrinal and Practical, preached in S. Andrew's Church, Liverpool. By William Lefroy, M.A., Incumbent.

Crown 8vo. 6s.

Sermons on the Epistles and Gospels

for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year. By the Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., Author of a "Devotional Commentary on the Gospel Narrative."

New Edition. Two Volumes. Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Sold separately.

Vol. I.—ADVENT TO WHITSUNTIDE.

Vol. II.—TRINITY TO ALL SAINTS' DAY.

Not Tradition, but Scripture. By the late

Philip Nicholas Shuttleworth, D.D., Warden of New College, Oxford, and Rector of Foxley, Wilts, afterwards Lord Bishop of Chichester.

Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

Questions illustrating the Thirty-Nine

Articles of the Church of England, with Proofs from Holy Scripture, and the Primitive Church. By Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Dean of Lichfield.

Sixth Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Bishopric of Souls. By Robert

Wilson Evans, B.D., late Vicar of Heversham and Archdeacon of Westmoreland. With an Introductory Memoir by Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Dean of Lichfield.

With Portrait. Fifth Edition. Small 8vo. 5s. 6d.

The Good Shepherd; or, Meditations

for the Clergy upon the Example and Teaching of Christ. By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, M.A., Rector of Brighstone, Author of "Allegories and Tales."

Second Edition, revised. Small 8vo. 3s.

Voices of Comfort, Original and Selected,

edited by the Rev. Thomas Vincent Fosbery, M.A., sometime Vicar of St. Giles's, Reading, Editor of "Hymns and Poems for the Sick and Suffering."

Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Short Sermons on the Psalms, in their

order, preached in a Village Church. By W. J. Stracey, M.A., Rector of Oxnead and Vicar of Buxton, Norfolk, formerly Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge.

Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Sold separately.

Vol. I.—Psalms I—XXV.

Vol. II.—Psalms XXVI—LI.

Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever :

A Poem in Twelve Books. By Edward Henry Bickersteth, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead.

Eleventh Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

A Presentation Edition, with red borders. Small 4to. 10s. 6d.

The Treasury of Devotion : a Manual

of Prayers for General and Daily Use. Compiled by a Priest. Edited by the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewer, Berks.

New Edition, in Large Type, Crown 8vo, 5s.; or in morocco limp, 10s. 6d.

The Smaller Edition, 18mo, 2s. 6d.; cloth limp, 2s., or bound with the Book of Common Prayer, 3s. 6d.

Comment upon the Collects appointed to

be used in the Church of England on Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year. By John James, D.D., sometime Canon of Peterborough.

New Edition. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Also a Fine Edition, on Toned Paper. Crown 8vo. 5s.

A Commentary, Expository and De-

votional, on the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, according to the Use of the Church of England, to which is added an Appendix on Fasting Communion, Non-Communicating Attendance, Auricular Confession, the Doctrine of Sacrifice, the Eucharistic Sacrifice. By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.D., Dean of Norwich.

Sixth Edition. Small 8vo. 6s.

Also, a Cheap Edition, uniform with "Thoughts on Personal Religion," and "The Pursuit of Holiness." 3s. 6d.

The Annual Register : a Review of Public

Events at Home and Abroad, from the Year 1863 to 1877.

8vo. 18s. each.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics.

It is hoped that the "Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics," which will comprise translations, compilations, and other works, will meet a need which has long been felt. As the devotional life of the Church of England has increased, so the demand for spiritual treatises has become more and more urgent, and has arisen from all classes of society. This series of books, some well known, some already oftentimes translated, and others, *it* may be, yet to be presented for the first time in an English dress, is intended to meet this want.

The aim of the translators is twofold. First, to provide the reader with a fair rendering of the original as far as possible un mutilated. It has been a common complaint of late, that translations have been marred by the absence of parts of the original, the exclusion of which a more intelligent view of Catholic devotion in the present day has rendered unnecessary. In these editions these omissions have been to a great extent supplied; yet at the same time any term or expression which may come under the imputation of being "un-English" has been reduced, as far as may be without destroying the thought, to its equivalent in Anglican phraseology and belief. Secondly, to translate the original into ordinary English, and thus to avoid the antiquated and stilted style of writing, which often makes books of this kind distasteful, or even sometimes unintelligible.

Elegantly printed with red borders, on extra superfine toned paper.

Small 8vo. 5s. each.

OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST. In 4 Books. By **Thomas à Kempis**. A New Translation.

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR: Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT; together with the Supplement and the Path of Paradise. By **Laurence Scupoli**. A New Translation.

THE DEVOUT LIFE. By **Saint Francis of Sales**, Bishop and Prince of Geneva. A New Translation.

THE LOVE OF GOD. By **Saint Francis of Sales**, Bishop and Prince of Geneva. A New Translation.

THE CONFESSIONS OF S. AUGUSTINE. In 10 Books. A New Translation.

The Volumes can also be had in the following extra bindings:—

	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Morocco, stiff or limp	9	0
Morocco, thick bevelled sides, Old Style	12	0
Morocco, limp, with flap edges	11	6
Morocco, best, stiff or limp	16	0
Morocco, best, thick bevelled sides, Old Style	19	6
Russia, limp	11	6
Russia, limp, with flap edges	13	6

Most of the above styles may be had illustrated with a beautiful selection of Photographs from Angelico, *4s. 6d. extra.*

CHEAP EDITIONS.

32mo, cloth limp, 6d. each, or cloth extra, 1s. each.

Of the Imitation of Christ.

The Spiritual Combat.

The Hidden Life of the Soul.

Spiritual Letters of Saint Francis of Sales.

The Christian Year.

These Five Volumes, cloth extra, may be had in a Box, price 7s., and also bound in Roan, Calf, Morocco, &c.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

New Pamphlets

- Did the Success of the Evangelical Movement of the Eighteenth Century chiefly consist in the Propagation of Dissent? An Enquiry suggested by an Article in the *Church Quarterly Review* of July 1877. By the Bishop of Llandaff.*
8vo. 1s. 6d.
- Reply to the Short Notice in the *Church Quarterly Review* of January 1878, of an Enquiry whether the Success of the Evangelical Movement of the Eighteenth Century chiefly consisted in the Propagation of Dissent? By the Bishop of Llandaff.*
8vo. 1s.
- The Burial-Place of Edmund de Langley, fifth son of King Edward III. A Sermon preached at King's Langley Church, Herts, on Tuesday, February 26, 1878. By the Bishop of St. Albans.*
8vo. 6d.
- A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's, at his Primary Visitation, October 30 to November 6, 1877. By William Basil Jones, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. David's.*
8vo. 1s.
- The Reform of Convocation. A Speech delivered at the Lichfield Diocesan Conference, in St. James's Hall, Lichfield, on Friday, September 28, 1877. By Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Dean of Lichfield, and Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury.*
8vo. 1s.
- Counsels of Peace for the Church of England. An Address to the Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Handsworth. Delivered at Smethwick, July 23, 1877. By Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Dean of Lichfield, and Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury.*
8vo. 6d.
- St. Paul's Message to Archippus. A Sermon preached in Lichfield Cathedral, on St. Matthew's Day, September 21, 1878, on the occasion of the Bishop of Lichfield's Primary Ordination. By Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Dean of Lichfield, and Prolocutor of the Convocation of Canterbury.*
Just Published. 8vo. 6d.
- The Freedom of Confession in the Church of England. A Letter to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. By the Rev. T. T. Carter, Rector of Clewer; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.*
Second Edition. 8vo. 1s.
- The Present Movement; A True Phase of Anglo-Catholic Church Principles. A Letter to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. By the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewer, Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.*
8vo. 1s. 6d.
- Are "Vows of Celibacy in Early Life" inconsistent with the Word of God? or, Some Remarks on the Lord Bishop of Lincoln's Letter to the Ven. Sir George Prevost, Bart., entitled "Sisterhoods and Vows." By the Rev. T. T. Carter, Rector of Clewer; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.*
8vo. 1s.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

*New Pamphlets**The Work of Christ in*

Central Africa. A Letter to the Rev. H. P. Liddon, D.D., D.C.L., Canon of St. Paul's, and Ireland Professor of Exegesis at the University of Oxford. By the Rev. J. P. Farler, B.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, Missionary in Central Africa, and Chaplain to Bishop Steere.

8vo. 1s.

Liberty of Confession in

the Church of England. A Sermon preached in the Church of S. Stephen, Lewisham, on the Eighth Sunday after Trinity, 1877. By R. Rhodes Bristow, M.A., Vicar.

8vo. 1s.

Reform in Convocation,

with some Notes on its Existing Constitution; being the substance of Letters addressed to the *Guardian*, and of a Paper read at a "Devotional Conference of the Clergy," held at Bodmin, September 1877. By the Rev. Henry Overy, M.A., Vicar of St. Veep, Cornwall.

8vo. 6d.

The Diocesan Synods of

the Earlier Church. By W. E. Scudamore, Rector of Ditchingham.

8vo. 1s.

The More Excellent Way

of Unity in the Church of Christ. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Maidstone, at the Ordinary Visitation in May 1878. With Notes. By Benjamin Harrison, M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone.

8vo. 1s.

Hymns for the Natural

Seasons. By Edward Henry Loring, M.A., Rector of Gillingham, Norfolk.

Imperial 16mo. With Music, 6d.

The Words only can also be had.
18mo, 1d.

Cyprus: a Sermon preach-

ed on July 21st, 1878. By the Rev. J. B. Harboard, M.A., R.N.

8vo. 6d.

Form of Prayer preparatory

to Confirmation. To which are added Devotions to be used in Private, before and after Confirmation.

*Second Edition. 12mo. 3d.**Pupil - Teachers: Their*

Training and Instruction; or, A Plea for the more careful consideration of Pupil-Teachers, so far as regards their Powers of Teaching and Learning, and the Demands made upon them. By the Rev. A. E. Northey, M.A., Principal of the Hockerill Training College, Bishop's Stortford.

8vo. 6d.

A Form of Prayer to be

used upon St. Andrew's Day, or upon any of the Seven Days next following. Being the Day or Days of Intercession for a Blessing upon the Missionary Work of the Church. Approved by the Two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury.

[Form, No. 2.]

Royal 32mo. 1d.

The Form for St. Andrew's Day or the Sunday next following, may be had separately.

[Form, No. 1.]

Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. per 100.

London, Oxford, and Cambridge

MESSRS. RIVINGTON *issue the under-mentioned Lists, which
may be had gratis and post free :—*

CLASSIFIED CATALOGUE OF BOOKS SELECTED FROM THEIR PUBLICATIONS.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS IN COURSE OF PUBLICATION.

LIST OF EDUCATIONAL BOOKS.

MONTHLY CLASSIFIED LIST OF ALL NEW BOOKS PUBLISHED IN THE
UNITED KINGDOM AND ON THE CONTINENT.

CATALOGUE OF A SELECTION FROM THEIR EDITIONS OF THE BIBLE,
PRAYER BOOK, ETC., AND THEIR DEVOTIONAL WORKS, IN
EXTRA BINDINGS.

RIVINGTONS : WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON
and at Oxford and Cambridge.





